

The School District of Lee County

Heights Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Heights Elementary School

15200 ALEXANDRIA CT, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://het.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Douglas Palow

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Heights Elementary School

15200 ALEXANDRIA CT, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://het.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Palow, Doug	Principal	<p>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 Vision2030 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.</p>
Carter, Anika	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Thorstad, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	<p>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</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, 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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,138

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	181	177	193	192	172	203	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1118
Attendance below 90 percent	8	17	16	17	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	8	7	14	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	14	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	16	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				68%	57%	57%	64%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	53%	39%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	62%	63%	69%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	65%	62%	60%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	54%	51%	46%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	52%	53%	64%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	72%	58%	14%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	62%	15%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42/23.5	85/46.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.5	1/4.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/15	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28/16.4	86/48.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10	3/15	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/13.3	3/15.8	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43/25.1	71/39.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/12.5	58/33.1	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/13.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/42.7	94/62.7	105/70
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/15.8	4/20	7/35
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/10	2/20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/13.5	67/46.2	95/63.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10.5	4/21.1	8/40
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/12.5	2/20
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/50	89/62.7	102/69.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/13.3	4/26.7	7/46.7
	English Language Learners	1/14.3	1/14.3	4/50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30/16.5	75/42.6	95/63.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/18.8	3/21.4	5/31.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/20	2/16.7

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/51.6	111/67.3	106/63.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/20	1/10
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/12.5	1/11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45/29.2	83/50.3	101/60.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	1/10	3/30
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/22.2	3/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	77/50.7	103/64.4	121/73.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/20	4/40
	English Language Learners	2/22.2	0/0	3/33.3

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	50	47	36	35	27	15				
ELL	38	55	67	45	68	79	50				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	36			43							
HSP	44	52	58	52	52	50	58				
MUL	71			76							
WHT	81	69	54	86	71	58	80				
FRL	45	58	54	53	51	39	56				
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				

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
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				
FRL	46	47	38	57	55	40	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Across grade levels and including subgroups, we have noticed that our biggest areas of need continues to arise from our lowest 25% in Math. We are seeing significantly lower gains produced year over year in our math programing and have therefore made that a focus for the current school year. We are seeing our ELL population making significant gains through the support of more rigorous and intensive ELL interventions and strategies. .

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our school level greatest need continues to be math, specifically in the area of the lowest 25%. We have noticed this is the percentage of iReady lessons passed as well as lower foundational skills in math exemplars and summative assessments. Our team will continue to monitoring failing scores as a primary area of concern

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Previously we had spent a large amount of focus on writing across the grade levels and in content areas. We believe this supported our growth in ELA Gains and therefore shifted our focus slightly from math content and scaffolding. We are committed to uncover more student driven innovative ways to provide our teachers with math resources that can be completed independently to ensure fact fluency and number retention are a solid foundation for all students. We continue to use iReady Math and Reflex Math programing to support our students. We have implemented competitive tracking to support student engagement and participation. We have also begun to focus on establishing math intervention at tier 2 and tier 3 levels. This will allow for more small group instruction, resource push in and reteach/practice sessions. Our leadership team will continue to promote differentiation of instruction to dig deeper into the data provided for each student and plan accordingly.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science Gains showed the most improvement from the 2019 FSA at 59% to 2021 FSA at 72%.

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

Our Leadership Team contribute many factors to the growth demonstrated from the 2019 FSA at 59% to the 2021 FSA at 72%. Our school implemented a Schoolwide STEM program as well as additional science allocated enrichment weekly for hands on practice and and learning. ALL students participate

weekly in STEM instruction with hands on application. This enrichment area is taught by a science teacher who focuses on vocabulary, science integration and hands on participation toward mastery of standards. We continue to use a science based interactive curriculum to ensure standards are taught with appropriate rigor.

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

We believe that by improving our IB focus on transdisciplinary themes in learning and enhancing the way in which our students are taught and see content knowledge, we will be able to more closely align the standards taught in the classroom setting with the hands on action of the learning process. Acceleration of learning comes when students have made clear, concise connections in their learning to real world application. The inquiry stage of IB is taught in all content areas to enhance student understanding.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to align curriculum standards across grade levels. Our grade level teams also meet to plan and incorporate InterBaucaulerette programing into their state standards of instruction. Our teams have the opportunity to participate in optional professional development opportunities in various classroom across the campus to experience a variety of different teaching and learning styles. Our teachers are encouraged to seek out a variety of different individualized professional development quarterly to implement into the classroom setting.

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

Our leadership team meets biweekly to review current programming for effectiveness in instruction. ELL/ESE/Intervention and IB components are discussed in each meeting to ensure all students needs are being met. School leadership has begun a mentoring program for all lover 25% in Math and ELA to ensure they receive support, remove external factors inhibiting learning and provide accountability in their learning. Weekly ,monitoring of the students progress through the mentor program will assist with awareness of the ELA standards. Instructional coaches are pushing into classrooms to provide intensive interventions during reteach blocks throughout the school days. Teacher data is reviewed by administration to ensure teachers are reteaching content relevant to standards mastery.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2021 Florida state FSA Math scores, we did not see adequate growth or the anticipated academic gains in our lowest 25% population of students. It was evident from the data collected throughout the school year that there needs to be more centralized and intensive focus on the learner, their time interacting with math foundational content skills and receiving scaffolded instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math proficiency levels in our lowest 25% assessment scores from 45% (L25%FSA 2021) TO 55% as measured by the 2022 Math state standardized assessment.
Monitoring:	Students will participate in weekly formative interactive checks for understanding during and ongoing throughout math instruction. Data collected from students specialized learning paths in iReady will be monitored for understanding. Quarterly diagnostic assessments will be administered to ensure accuracy of concept based skills.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>School wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. We will implement additional academic supports for grade levels during intervention blocks and during the school instructional day to target specific groups of students in math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 -Instructional Coaches and Math Grade Level Experts modeling and providing professional development opportunities -Provide Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time -Coaching/Mentoring with a peer -Classroom Walk Throughs during math block -Goal setting -Use of instructional guides/curriculum maps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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)</p> <p>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size</p>

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 as available.

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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The 2021 FSA ELA data, shows an Increase of 10% for our Lowest 25% ELA learning gains. It was evident from the data that there is a need for more focus on the learner growth patterns, 90 minute reading block, 45-60 minute intervention time for ELA, and using more rigor and relevance needed with an emphasis on differentiation/remediation.</p> <p>FSA ELA Data: 2020-2021: 56% 2019-2020: COVID 2018-2019: 46% 2017-2018: 39% 2016-2017: 49%</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA Lowest 25% learning gains from 56% to 60% as measured by the 2022 FSA state standardized assessment
Monitoring:	<p>Use of formative and summative assessments</p> <p>quarterly diagnostic assessments</p> <p>Use of Exemplars based upon standards</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 -Instructional Coaches and ELA Grade Level Experts modeling and providing professional development -Provide Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time -Coaching/Mentoring with a peer -Classroom Walk Throughs during ELA block -Goal setting -Use of instructional guides/curriculum maps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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)</p> <p>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size</p>

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The school's discipline data continues to be one of the lowest in the district. The overall school culture is based on the International Baccalaureate PYP that is offered at Heights Elementary. The continued academic focus continues to be academic, social, and emotional growth for all students. The school culture is also based on the ongoing develop of out PBIS program.

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.

The school's discipline data continues to be one of the lowest in the district. The overall school culture is based on the International Baccalaureate PYP that is offered at Heights Elementary. The continued academic focus continues to be academic, social, and emotional growth for all students. The school culture is also based on the ongoing develop of out PBIS program.

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

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00