



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New Heights Elementary School

3901 37TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

<http://www.pcsb.org/newheights-es>

## Demographics

Principal: Christopher Boulanger

Start Date for this Principal: 4/14/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (34%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New Heights Elementary School

3901 37TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

<http://www.pcsb.org/newheights-es>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>73%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

The vision of New Heights Elementary School is to create a learning environment where each and every stakeholder are working to reach their highest potential.

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

The mission of New Heights Elementary is to establish an effective learning environment which will develop high achieving and responsible citizens by maintaining high expectations, building positive relationships and providing relevant and rigorous learning experiences

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boulanger, Christopher	Principal	
Robles, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Wyne, Kurt	Assistant Principal	
Ditmyer Brown, Yvette	Instructional Coach	
Peppers, Courtney	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 4/14/2021, Christopher Boulanger

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

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

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

641

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	126	107	118	97	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	668
Attendance below 90 percent	19	24	20	34	22	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	44	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	48	49	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	15	22	26	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	10	12	33	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Tuesday 6/28/2022

**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	115	86	92	95	106	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	25	40	35	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**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	115	86	92	95	106	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	25	40	35	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

Students with two or more indicators      0   1   0   1   1   1   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   4

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year      0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0

Students retained two or more times      0   0   0   10   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   10

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	55%	56%				32%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						55%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						52%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	51%	50%				33%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						45%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						37%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	62%	59%				40%	53%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	20%	56%	-36%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	21%	62%	-41%	62%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	64%	-27%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	30		21	45		8				
ELL	27	77		37	81	62	22				
ASN	41	57		59	61		53				
BLK	20	39	24	20	45	40	5				
HSP	45	65		35	70	58	33				
MUL	32	55		47	91						
WHT	30	69		39	46		19				
FRL	29	54	50	35	58	43	29				

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	19	50		24	46						
ELL	26	62		28	71		33				
ASN	58	83		56	75		50				
BLK	17	31		21	37		18				
HSP	38	52		37	67		39				
MUL	35			41							
WHT	31	52		33	67		52				
FRL	28	52	57	30	59	56	41				
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	16	54	50	21	44	32	18				
ELL	27	62	75	38	68	60	50				
ASN	55	64		63	72		54				
BLK	13	44	44	17	21	15	11				
HSP	36	50	82	31	51		45				
MUL	42	67		37	50						
WHT	35	60	50	36	51	58	53				
FRL	31	54	55	31	39	31	41				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	58
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	56
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	41
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

After reviewing the '21-'22 performance data the following trends have emerged:

- ELA 3 year Gain (Overall/L25) trends are positive and moving steadily towards 60% goal
- Math 3 year Overall Gain trend is positive. While the L25 Gains have been erratic.
- ELA 3 year Proficiency is stagnant at around 33%
- Math 3 year Proficiency is showing a slight upward trend but overall rating would be stagnant in the mid 30's
- Science 3 year Proficiency has shown a sharp decline this past year
- ESSA Scores are showing a positive 3 year trend overall
- SWD subgroup has shown decline on point index score and is below 41% threshold
- African American subgroup, while showing a upward trend over 3 year period is still not performing above 41%
- 6 of 8 ESSA subgroups are above 41% on point index
- ELL Progress in Language Acquisition is showing a sharp steep gain on 3 year monitoring

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data that is showing highest need of improvement includes:

- ELA and Math Proficiency
- Math L25 Gains

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

Instruction is not consistently meeting rigor of standards. Building teacher capacity to ensure instruction is consistently at grade level through knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Data with the largest gains YOY includes:

- FSA
- ELA Overall Gains +7%
- ELA L25 Gains +3%
- ESSA
- Multi Racial Subgroup +18%
- Hispanic Subgroup +8%
- ELL Subgroup +9%

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

Contributing factors from this school year included:

- Increased discussion of scholar progress with specific goal setting for each scholar along with connected support to Core instruction

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

Strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning include:

- Early identification of scholars learning opportunities
- Focused intervention using data to drive instructional decisions

**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.**

PD will focus on in depth analysis of B.E.S.T. standards including increasing teacher capacity of taxonomy and rigor identification within standards. In addition we will be continuing to build capacity of our Gk-G2 teachers and their knowledge of teaching foundational reading skills to increase the number of proficient readers.

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

Coaching support will be increased to be more present in classrooms for lesson modeling and development as well as on the spot co-teaching when necessary

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus** Instructional Practice specifically aligned to Standards aligned instruction will allow  
**Description and Rationale:** New Heights to focus on building teacher capacity with research-based strategies that will align with B.E.S.T. standards within core content areas.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Summative data that was collected throughout the 21-22 school year showed greater than 50% of scholars performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science. In addition, grade level data collected during both formal and informal walk-throughs showed a trend of instruction and tasks students were assigned were not consistent within each grade level. This indicates that the majority of our scholars were not given ample exposure to grade level standards aligned tasks along further indicating limited instructional knowledge and resources for teachers to implement consistently.

By October 2022, walkthrough trend data will show 80% of observed instruction being aligned across grade level and at the appropriate rigor of the standard being taught

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

By December 2022, walkthrough trend data will show 100% of observed instruction being aligned across grade level and at the appropriate rigor of the standard being taught

By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in ELA will indicate 45% of scholars scoring proficient or above grade level.

By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in Math will indicate 45% of scholars scoring proficient or above grade level.

By December of 2022 Common Assessment Data in Science will indicate 50% of scholars scoring proficient or above grade level.

By May of 2022 F.A.S.T. Data will indicate that 50% of scholars are proficient in Math, Science and ELA in GK-G5

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

Administration will monitor student performance and walkthrough data weekly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

Ensuring that an aligned learning plan is in place will increase consistency of instruction across grade levels



**Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers and administrators engage in the just-in-time training they need to support implementation of the curriculum and other instructional initiatives already underway.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

**Person Responsible** Amy Robles (robles-goodricha@pcsb.org)

Provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep & lesson rehearsal for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

**Person Responsible** Amy Robles (robles-goodricha@pcsb.org)

Regularly collaborate as a leadership team to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal-setting around improving student outcomes including, but not limited to teacher support, community outreach, and strengthening a culture of high expectations for all students.

**Person Responsible** Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Student performance data collected from common assessments as well as observationally indicates a need for increased focused on our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup. Although schoolwide trend data shows an overall student proficiency performance below 50%, our SWD subgroup was consistently below the school average in each grade level. In addition ESSA trend data, has indicated that this subgroup is performing below the 41% threshold indicating a growth opportunity to build teacher capacity to better identify and meet individual student needs.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**  
 By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in ELA will indicate our Students with Disabilities are performing performing equal to or above the school average.  
 By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in Math will indicate our Students with Disabilities are performing equal to or above the school average.  
 By May of 2022 F.A.S.T. data will indicate our Students with Disabilities are performing equal to or above school average in all content areas.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**  
 Administration and Leadership Team will monitor performance data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**  
 Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**  
 Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is consistent, designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles aimed at meeting the needs of this subgroup.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/**  
 Focusing monitoring on instruction will increase a more engaged level of planning and consistency of intentionality for this subgroup.

**criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible** Amy Robles (robles-goodricha@pcsb.org)

Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff

**Person Responsible** Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Student performance data collected from common assessments as well as observationally indicates a need for increased focused on our Black and African American subgroup. Although schoolwide trend data shows an overall student proficiency performance below 50%, our African American subgroup was consistently below the school average in each grade level. In addition ESSA trend data has indicated that this subgroup is performing below the 41% threshold indicating a growth opportunity to build teacher capacity to better identify and meet individual student needs

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

By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in ELA will indicate our African American scholars are performing equal to or above the school average.  
 By December of 2022 Progress Monitoring data in Math will indicate our African American scholars are performing equal to or above the school average.  
 By May of 2022 F.A.S.T. data will indicate that our African American scholars are performing equal to or above the school average.

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

Administration and Leadership Team will monitor performance data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is consistent, designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles aimed at meeting the needs of this subgroup.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the**

Focusing monitoring on instruction will increase a more engaged level of planning and consistency of intentionality for this subgroup.

**resources/  
criteria used for  
selecting this  
strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible** Amy Robles (robles-goodricha@pcsb.org)

Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff

**Person Responsible** Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Consistent, Aligned, Foundational Reading Instruction and the ease in which scholars are working with grade level texts is having a negative impact on scholar performance in Reading ELA:  
- GK scholars showed that 50% of would perform below grade level on Spring Map.

- G1 scholars showed that over 60% of would perform below grade level on Spring Map
- G2 scholars showed that over 60% of would perform below grade level on Spring Map

### **Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Consistent, Aligned, grade level Instruction along with appropriate remediation to help struggling readers catch up is having a negative impact on scholar performance in Reading ELA:

- G3 showed that 25% of scholars scored at a level 3 or higher
- G4 showed that 45% of scholars scored at a level 3 or higher

#### **Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### **Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

As measured by M.A.P. performance during the '21-'22 school year:

- GK showed that 55% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- G1 showed that 24% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- G2 showed that 34% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- Overall, in GK-G2 37% of scholars were performing on grade level

Using the Progress Monitoring system during the '22-'23 school year OUR goals are as follows:

- GK 70% at or above grade level
- G1 70% at or above grade level
- G2 50% at or above grade level
- Overall, in GK-G2, 60% of scholars will be performing at or above grade level

#### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

As measured by FSA performance during the '21-'22 school year:

- G3 showed that 25% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- G4 showed that 45% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- G5 showed that 28% of their scholars were performing on grade level
- Overall, in G3-G5 33% of scholars were performing on grade level

Using the Progress Monitoring system during the '22-'23 school year OUR goals are as follows:

- G3 40% at or above grade level
- G4 40% at or above grade level
- G5 50% at or above grade level
- Overall, in G3-G5, 40% of scholars will be performing at or above grade level

#### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Leadership team will meet weekly to review progress monitoring trends. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted as a team to monitor for effective instruction. Trends will be debriefed weekly and shared with teams. Bi-weekly data PLCs will be held with teams or individual teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boulanger, Christopher, [boulangerc@pcsb.org](mailto:boulangerc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Focusing monitoring on instruction will increase a more engaged level of planning and consistency of intentionality.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.</p>	<p>Boulanger, Christopher, boulangerc@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.</p>	<p>Boulanger, Christopher, boulangerc@pcsb.org</p>

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

New Heights Elementary (NHES) looks to build a positive school culture and environment through multiple channels and outlets. For the 2022-23 school year NHES will hold monthly student recognition events that recognize students for their positive behavior, academic performance as well as contribution to the school community. NHES also includes staff recognition in their weekly update that includes peer to peer recognition opportunities as well as administration recognizing positive impacts by staff members to our school community. Additionally, for the 2022-23 school year NHES will be implementing new Parent Teacher nights aimed at increasing parent capacity regarding their students current levels of performance as well as the role they can play at home as an instructional partner. New Heights will also be implementing monthly parent open forums where parents and other stakeholders are invited to attend meetings that will offer some helpful information as well as provide an opportunity for parents to voice concerns or ask questions.

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

- Administration - setting tone, direction and expectation school wide of what positive culture and environment looks and feels like.
- Instructional Staff - setting tone, direction and expectation in classroom that aligns with schoolwide vision
- Support Staff - setting tone, direction and expectation within their roles that aligns with schoolwide vision
- Students - Meeting expectations of school as well as influencing others through example.
- Parents - Supporting school by providing support, when needed. Providing feedback as to how we can better serve our community
- Community - Supporting efforts to increase positive climate and culture within school by providing resources and volunteer capital. In addition, providing feedback to school when necessary to help grow.