# Heights Elementary School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Heights Elementary School

## 15200 ALEXANDRIA CT, Fort Myers, FL 33908

### http://het.leeschools.net/

---

**Demographics**

---

## Principal: Douglas Palow
Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 77% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (59%)<br><br>2017-18: B (57%)<br><br>2016-17: A (63%)<br><br>2015-16: B (58%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Table of Contents

# Heights Elementary School

## 15200 ALEXANDRIA CT, Fort Myers, FL 33908

### http://het.leeschools.net/

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | No | 60% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 46% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | B | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Heights Elementary IB World School is dedicated to developing balanced, lifelong learners through educational excellence, a global perspective, reflection and action.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To be a world-class school.

### 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 |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Palow, Doug | Principal | Provide instructional leadership that ensures continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provides organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that supports high performance expectations for all stakeholders. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement and communicates the relationship among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance. Creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the school. Organizes and provides staff development opportunities for all members of the school community. Facilitates parent involvement in the school community. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports the district's Vision 2030 Plan. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth. |
| Carter, Anika | Assistant Principal | Assists the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assists the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assumes full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development and demonstrate fiscal responsibility to maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities. Analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports the district's Vision 2030 plan. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth. |
| Lytle, Dorothy | Instructional Coach | Supports all instructional staff with English Language Arts instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. The ELA Instructional Coach actively works with targeted groups of students. She models research-based instructional practices for staff both in the classroom with students and as a part of our continuous professional development program. Our ELA Instructional Coach is also our ELL Contact and supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making based on program needs and individual student needs.The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth. |
| Licata, Michael | Dean | Enforces and applies the School Board's policies regarding student discipline in school and on bus and attendance within the school. Assists the Principal in protecting the health and welfare of students and in maintaining a healthy and safe environment for students and staff. Maintains fair, reasonable, and consistent student discipline within the school and on the bus. Assists students in establishing high standards of conduct and provide recommendations for conflict resolution. Assists with implementing school wide Positive Behavior Intervention Supports initiatives; assists instructional staff with best practices, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth. |
| Thorstad, Lindsey | Instructional Coach | Supports the District's vision in providing a school-wide Multi-Tiered System of Support/Early Warning System (MTSS/EWS) and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system. Facilitates the implementation of MTSS/EWS and PBS at the school level. Works closely with the District Intervention Support Specialist for MTSS/EWS and PBS. Facilitates and supports targeted student interventions to implement and sustain MTSS/EWS and PBS processes at the individual student, classroom, and school-based levels. Provides evidence-based professional development training, instructional coaching, and technical assistance to support data-based problem solving. Utilizes data to inform ongoing school-based professional development, technical assistance, and coaching so as to improve the fidelity of MTSS/EWS and PBS implementation processes and overall student and staff outcomes. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 6/15/2020, Douglas Palow

**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.*
7

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 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 |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 77% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (58%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

* 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 | 151 | 183 | 177 | 171 | 190 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1033 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

**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 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

**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 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 10/24/2020

### 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 | 188 | 192 | 192 | 212 | 178 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 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 | 18 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

**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 | 53 | 20 | 15 | 31 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

**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 | 188 | 192 | 192 | 212 | 178 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1147 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 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 | 18 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

**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 | 53 | 20 | 15 | 31 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

## 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 | 68% | 57% | 57% | 66% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | 56% | 58% | 60% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 50% | 53% | 49% | 49% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 71% | 62% | 63% | 72% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | 65% | 62% | 71% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 54% | 51% | 68% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 52% | 53% | 56% | 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 | 72% | 58% | 14% | 58% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 55% | 5% | 57% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 71% | 55% | 16% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 53% | 13% | 56% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 59% | 54% | 5% | 56% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 52% | 12% | 55% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 74% | 61% | 13% | 62% | 12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 65% | 58% | 7% | 62% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 77% | 62% | 15% | 64% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 58% | 18% | 62% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 60% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 57% | 9% | 61% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 50% | 7% | 53% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 52% | 11% | 55% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 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 |
| SWD | 27 | 38 | 35 | 27 | 41 | 39 | 34 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 46 | 36 | 38 | 52 | 47 | 23 | | | | |
| ASN | 94 | | | 94 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 58 | 54 | 47 | 45 | 33 | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 53 | 42 | 59 | 64 | 52 | 38 | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | 56 | | 71 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 61 | 58 | 81 | 70 | 57 | 75 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 56 | 48 | 57 | 53 | 40 | 37 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 23 | 43 | 41 | 27 | 33 | 27 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 43 | 36 | 25 | 45 | 38 | | | | | |
| ASN | 95 | 43 | | 89 | 64 | | 70 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 45 | 31 | 39 | 55 | 38 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 47 | 41 | 57 | 54 | 41 | 51 | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 63 | | 62 | 38 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 60 | 38 | 81 | 66 | 56 | 77 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 46 | 47 | 38 | 57 | 55 | 40 | 47 | | | | |

| 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 |
| SWD | 25 | 48 | 46 | 34 | 49 | 48 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 43 | 38 | 35 | 70 | 67 | 8 | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 82 | | 95 | 88 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 38 | 31 | 43 | 38 | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 50 | 50 | 59 | 73 | 69 | 36 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 64 | 48 | 82 | 72 | 77 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 49 | 47 | 54 | 67 | 64 | 35 | | | | |

## 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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 60 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 476 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 42 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 94 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| 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 | 66 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 69 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| 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.**

FSA Math lower 25% was the data component that showed the lowest performance. During the 2019-2020 school year, FSA Math lower 25% was at 46%. This year it only increased to 48%. The amount of math intervention time was on the lower side. Differentiation of the math lessons was also something that will be addressed in the future to meet the math needs for all of our students. Each grade level focused on the math standards during their math instructional time. Not focusing directly on each L25% student's individual math needs was a contributing factor to a low performance and will be addressed during the 20-21 school year.

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

The science data was where we saw the greatest decline from prior years. This year we used a new science curriculum and resources. This was an adjustment from prior resources that were being used. The lack of focusing on all of the 3rd, 4th & 5th grade science standards was a contributing factor to the decline in science scores. As we move forward out STEM class will continue to hit the standards and continue to build a stronger science foundation for all of students K-5.

**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.**

The greatest gap is with the ELA L25%. The focus will need to be on the state standards and meeting the needs for each students. Differentiation will need to increase and digging deeper into the data will be the first step for this process. Providing professional development that is focused on differentiation and meeting the needs of the students will also provide the opportunity to implement new strategies in the classroom.

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

ELA Lower 25% is where we saw the most improvement form 39% to 46%. One of our major focuses during the 2019-2020 school was writing in all of the content areas. We will continue to implement writing but also create a stronger focus on building on the vocabulary with each grade level. Creating stronger mentor groups focusing on meeting the students academic needs is another action we are putting into place for the 2020-2021 school year. Weekly monitoring of the students progress through the mentor program will assist with awareness of the ELA standards.

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

Course failures in ELA or math will be out first area of concern. Meeting the students academic need and them showing growth in ELA or math continues to be our school wide focus. If we are having that many student showing course failure in ELA or math we are meeting that need. We will regroup with each grade level and dig deeper into the problem and develop solutions to address this concern. The second focus will be on suspensions in each grade level. One of our goals is to decrease our referrals by 15% during the 2020-2021 school year. This year we are implementing a more detailed discipline plan in all areas of the building. The focus will come from PBIS and ongoing training for our staff.

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

1. Increase science scores from 59% to 65%
2. Increase ELA lowest 25%(which includes ESSA SWD) learning gains from 46% to 52%
3. Increase math lowest 25% (which includes ESSA SWD) learning gains from 48% to 55%
4. Decrease unexcused absences by 10%
5. Decrease discipline referrals by 15%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The 2019 Science data, shows a decrease of 5% on the state science assessment. It was evident from the data collected throughout the school year that the need for more focus on the learner, time for science, and using more rigor and relevance is needed with an emphasis on differentiation/remediation with the science standards.<br>Science School Data:<br>2017-2018: 46%<br>2016-2017: 68% |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase state science assessment scores from 59% to 64% as measured by the 2020 state science assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 5th grade students will receive extra exposure to the 3rd,4th, & 5th grade science standards during a STEM enrichment class.The PSell manual will be supplemented with the current Science curriculum to cover all of the science standards. Additional instructional supports will be provided to 5th grade classes during the science block.<br>-PLC Data meetings/data chats with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports and to track student progress<br>-Instructional Coaches and Science Grade Level Experts modeling and providing professional development<br>-Provide Assistance and Resources when possible including science block<br>-Coaching/Mentoring with a peer<br>-Classroom Walk Throughs during Science block<br>-Goal setting<br>-Use of instructional guides/curriculum maps |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)<br>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size<br>Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size<br>Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size<br>MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size<br>Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size<br>High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size<br>Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size<br>Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size<br>Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size |

### Action Steps to Implement

Students targeted will be the 5th grade students taking the state Science assessment in May.
5th grade teachers will analyze quarterly science data during grade level PLC's to self-reflect and discuss instructional practices regarding FL Science standards.
Each quarter, students will take the science quarterly assessment. The data will be reviewed with the Leadership Team, grade levels, and individual teachers (data chats.)
Departmentalization in 5th grade will allow additional time for science instruction.
Based on information learned during the Model School Conference, rigor and relevance have been presented during professional development for teachers.

District created Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Guides to help teachers with the identify the most important science standards, and resources to support science instruction.

**Person Responsible** Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The 2018 FSA Math data, shows a decrease of 22% for our Lowest 25% learning gains. STAR Math was used to track data through the year and showed a 6% decrease, but in 2016-2017, the STAR Math was optional so only Q1 and Q2 were captured. It was evident from the data that the need for more focus on the learner, time for math, and using more rigor and relevance is needed with an emphasis on differentiation/remediation. <br> FSA School Data: <br> 2018-2019: 48% <br> 2017-2018: 46% <br> 2016-2017: 68% |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase Math lowest 25% learning gains from 48% to 51% as measured by the 2021 FSA Math assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | School-wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to targeted groups of students in math. <br> -PLC Data meetings/data chats with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports and to track student progress <br> -Instructional Coaches and Math Grade Level Experts modeling and providing professional development <br> -Provide Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time <br> -Coaching/Mentoring with a peer <br> -Classroom Walk Throughs during math block <br> -Goal setting <br> -Use of instructional guides/curriculum maps |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above) <br> Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size <br> Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size <br> Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size <br> MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size <br> Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size <br> High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size <br> Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size <br> Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size <br> Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size |

### Action Steps to Implement

Students targeted will be the Lowest 25% learning gains based on the data from the 2019 Math assessment.
Teachers will analyze FY19 Math data during grade level PLC's to self-reflect and discuss instructional practices regarding FL Math standards.
Each quarter, students will take the i-Ready Math assessment. The data for the Lowest 25% will be

reviewed with the Leadership Team, grade levels, and individual teachers (data chats.)
Departmentalization in grades 4 and 5 will allow additional time for math instruction.
Based on information learned during the Model School Conference, rigor and relevance have been presented during professional development for teachers.
District created Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Guides to help teachers with the identify the most important math standards, and resources to support math instruction.
Math Coach will push in to classrooms to work with the Lowest 25% to increase their learning gains.
Math Coach will meet with teachers and provide additional math resources for differentiation/remediation.
Intervention Specialist will push in/pull out to provide support for those students in the MTSS process.
Leadership Team and Enrichment Teachers will mentor/check-in with students in the Lowest 25%.
Paraprofessionals will push in to provide additional support for teachers teaching the Lowest 25%.

**Person Responsible**   Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The 2019 FSA ELA data, shows an increase of 5% for our Lowest 25% learning gains. It was evident from the data that the need for more focus on the learner, 90 minute reading block, 45-60 minute intervention time for ELA, and using more rigor and relevance needed with an emphasis on differentiation/remediation.<br><br>FSA ELA Data:<br>2018-2019: 46%<br>2017-2018: 39%<br>2016-2017: 49% |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | ncrease ELA Lowest 25% learning gains from 46% to 50% as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA assessment |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | School-wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to targeted groups of students in ELA block.<br>-PLC Data meetings/data chats with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports and to track student progress<br>-Instructional Coaches and ELA Grade Level Experts modeling and providing professional development<br>-Provide Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time<br>-Coaching/Mentoring with a peer<br>-Classroom Walk Throughs during ELA block<br>-Goal setting<br>-Use of instructional guides/curriculum maps |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)<br>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size<br>Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size<br>Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size<br>MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size<br>Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size<br>High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size<br>Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size<br>Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size<br>Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size |

## Action Steps to Implement

Students targeted will be the Lowest 25% learning gains based on the data from the 2019 FSA ELA assessment.
Teachers will analyze FY19 FSA ELA data during grade level PLC's to self-reflect and discuss instructional practices regarding FL ELA standards.
Each quarter, students will take the i-Ready ELA assessment. The data for the Lowest 25% will be reviewed with the Leadership Team, grade levels, and individual teachers (data chats).

Master schedule to include a 90 minute reading block and 45-60 minute intervention time, WIN (What I Need).

Based on information learned during the Model School Conference, rigor and relevance have been presented during professional development for teachers.

District created Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Guides to help teachers with the identify the most important ELA standards, and resources to support ELA instruction.

Reading Coach will push in to classrooms to work with the Lowest 25% to increase their learning gains.

Reading Coach will meet with teachers and provide additional ELA resources for differentiation/ remediation.

Intervention Specialist will push in/pull out to provide support for those students in the MTSS process.

Leadership Team and Enrichment Teachers will mentor/check-in with students in the Lowest 25%.

Paraprofessionals will push in to provide additional support for teachers teaching the Lowest 25%.

**Person Responsible**   Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)

| #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | In the 2018-2019 school year, Heights Elementary processed 84 referrals. 37% of those referrals were from a diverse group of students new to the school. In 2019-2020, using T.E.A.C.H. strategies, professional development for teachers on the Love and Logic behavior system, creating Essential Agreements in each classroom, and having grade levels have a consistent set of behavior and set consequences, including parent contact, before writing a referral will decrease the total number of referrals by 15% or less referrals processed |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | In the 2019-2020 school year, the number of referrals as measured by the District Student Discipline Summary will decrease by 12% or 34 less referrals processed. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Developing a new school wide expectation with PBIS. This year we are rolling out PBIS school wide to assist with creating a positive learning culture for our students and staff. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will post their Essential Agreements in the classroom. When behavior warrants a visit to the office, the student along with accompanying behavior form, and documentation of parent contact. Administration will talk with students and provide strategies the student may use in place of the behavior. If teachers write a referral, then Administration will make a decision, based on the evidence provided, to process the referral. The number of referrals will be monitored monthly through the District Student Discipline Summar |

| Action Steps to Implement |
|---|

Teachers help guide students through the process to create the Essential Agreements for their classrooms.
Love and Logic behavior model ongoing professional development for teachers. Small article is school newsletter to give parents tips on using Love and Logic at home.
Each grade level will create their list of behaviors and consequences.
Teachers will communicate with parents either through student agendas, email, phone calls, or face to face regarding behavior concerns.
Each grade level creates a behavior form for students to complete and given a chance to write a reflection.
Enrichment teachers will use a Behavior Form, given to teachers and to be sent home to parents to let parents know of behavior concerns

| **Person Responsible** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The unexcused absences data from the 2018-2019 school year shows Heights Elementary had 6,828 unexcused absences as compared to 3,082 excused absences. During the 2017-2018 school year, Heights had 7,020 unexcused absences as compared to 2,974 excused absences. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | In the 2019-2020, the number of unexcused absences will decrease 15% from 6,828 to 5,804 as measured by the unexcused absence data provided in Focus. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teacher's monitor and report any information regarding unexcused absences from parents.<br>Ongoing discussion between Information Specialist and Social Worker; School Counselor and Social Worker. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | School Counselor pulls unexcused absences approximately every four weeks.<br>Measure against unexcused absence data quarterly as provided in Focus.<br>Increasing the number instructional minutes in the classroom. Reducing the unexcused absences will assist with increasing instructional time. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Teacher monitors and reports three absences to the School Counselor as an Early Warning.
Information Specialist provides and consults with Social Worker on students with excessive absences.
School Counselor pulls absence data approximately every four weeks.
School Counselor consults with Social Worker when absences reach five in a quarter, either the School Counselor or Social Worker will call parent and offer help depending on individual student/family need.
School Counselor meets with Principal and updates the Leadership Team during their bi-monthly meeting.
Principal has attendance as a standard agenda item for discussion on the bi-monthly Leadership Team meetings.

| **Person Responsible** | Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**NA**

## 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.

To build positive relations with parents, families, and other community stakeholders:
-Several events are planned throughout the school year that involve parents such as Meet The Teacher Night,
Curriculum Night, Student Led Conferences, celebrations and non-academic activities such as Panther Fit, Jump
Rope for Heart
-Parents and community members are encouraged to volunteer in the school and father figures to join the Watch
D.O.G.S.
-Monthly school newsletter (Heights Happenings) listing upcoming events and "Happenings" in the school.
-Parents and community members invited to join and/or attend School Advisory Council meetings where the vision and mission, along with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are discussed and changed.
-Use of teacher websites to communicate with parents about homework and classwork.
-Use of Parentlink/School Messenger to communicate events, late buses, to parents.
-Parents and community members speak in various classrooms to explain about their job and how it works.
-Community members participate in the beginning of our 5th grade Exhibition, by telling students about their jobs
and what they will need to be college and career ready when they leave high school.
All parents, community and staff members are invited to participate in School Advisory Committee (SAC) to discuss the school's mission and goals of the school. During SAC meetings, we also review the School Improvement Plan (SIP), monitor school data, identify the needs of the school and modify or create new goals as deemed necessary. Parents and community members' input is discussed and taken into consideration when creating SIP goals.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.