

Pinellas County Schools

New Heights Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

New Heights Elementary School

3901 37TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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.

Provide the school's vision 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.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boulanger, Christopher	Principal	Organize for reduction of barriers for Instructional Team, Facilitate Leadership Team, Management of SIP Initiatives and Monitoring for effectiveness.
Robles, Amy	Assistant Principal	Monitor Primary Literacy Initiative and Manage teacher PD SIP Initiatives
Wyne, Kurt	Assistant Principal	Support for monitoring and input of scholar data and provide PD focused on SIP initiatives.
Peppers, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Monitor scholar performance with focus on L25 subgroup. Oversee and implement RtI process.
Walsh, Abby	Instructional Coach	Monitor instructional efficacy in regard to SIP goals in Math
Ditata, Sharon	Instructional Coach	Monitor instructional efficacy in regard to SIP goals in ELA with a focus on primary scholars.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Discussions around the development of the 2023-24 SIP for New Heights began after PM3 of the 2022-23 SY. Stakeholders (Scholars, Teachers, Leadership) were surveyed as to where they saw our schools areas of growth. Families were brought in to the discussion during individual scholar performance discussions and where they saw their scholars needs.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP goals will be monitored continually through weekly PLC's. All members of Leadership team will be responsible for monitoring effectiveness of instruction as it relates to SIP initiatives as well as development of any pivots found necessary in response to scholar performance.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	6	28	28	32	21	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	2	40	25	10	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	40	25	10	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	58	40	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	52	38	0	0	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	23	26	18	15	5	0	0	0	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	35	52	29	0	0	0	122

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	24	20	34	22	12	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	44	23	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	48	49	27	0	0	0	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	15	22	26	8	15	0	0	0	91

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	12	33	22	28	0	0	0	105

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	24	20	34	22	12	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	2	7	8	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	44	23	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	48	49	27	0	0	0	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	15	22	26	8	15	0	0	0	91

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	12	33	22	28	0	0	0	105

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	54	53	33	55	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				56			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			52		
Math Achievement*	45	61	59	36	51	50	34		
Math Learning Gains				57			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			59		
Science Achievement*	46	62	54	28	62	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	64	59	68			45		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	233
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	23	Yes	4	4
HSP	45			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	50			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	58			
BLK	28	Yes	3	3
HSP	54			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			45			46					69
SWD	15			18							3	
ELL	42			60			42				5	69
AMI												
ASN	58			71							4	67
BLK	21			23			33				4	
HSP	37			48			43				5	69
MUL	64			62							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	47			52			56				4	
FRL	37			44			45				5	71

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	33	56	55	36	57	45	28					68
SWD	13	30		21	45		8					
ELL	27	77		37	81	62	22					68
AMI												
ASN	41	57		59	61		53					74
BLK	20	39	24	20	45	40	5					
HSP	45	65		35	70	58	33					69
MUL	32	55		47	91							
PAC												
WHT	30	69		39	46		19					
FRL	29	54	50	35	58	43	29					68

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	32	49	52	34	56	59	39					45
SWD	19	50		24	46							
ELL	26	62		28	71		33					45
AMI												
ASN	58	83		56	75		50					65
BLK	17	31		21	37		18					
HSP	38	52		37	67		39					41
MUL	35			41								
PAC												
WHT	31	52		33	67		52					
FRL	28	52	57	30	59	56	41					41

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	62%	-23%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	66%	-10%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	61%	-20%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	60%	-15%	51%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

While All content areas showed gains YOY:

- ELA +11% (44%)
- Math +11% (47%)
- Science +17% (45%)

ELA and Math proficiency rates still showed at a lower-than-expected rate. Contributing factors to these performances include:

- Small group instruction (both Core support and Skill remediation) was inconsistent and not designed to meet the scholars immediate and long-term needs.

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

Trend data did not show any notable decline.

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.

For the 23-24 SY SSA showed the greatest gap from the state average at a deficit of -15%. Although the deficit is substantial the school is trending in a positive direction. Factors that contribute to the lag is scholar background knowledge and vocabulary.

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

While all content areas showed a double-digit gain in percentage of scholars proficient, Science was the highest rate of improvement YOY. A focus on Science instruction through an ELA lens played a major role in this increase.

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

In reviewing EWS data for the 22-23 SY the following category was of most concern:

1. Scholars missing 10% or more days of school

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

1. Improve consistency and alignment of Small Group Instruction (Both Core Support and Skill Remediation/Enrichment)
2. Consistent and aligned core instruction at the rigor of the grade level standard
3. Increase attendance rates of scholars missing more than 10%

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While continuing to focus on ensuring a strong level of core instruction is in place for all learners, the instructional focus for the 2023-24 school year will be aimed at increasing instructional capacity within Small Group instruction. This includes Small Group Core Support and Small Group Intervention/Enrichment. This was identified as our area of focus as our instructional team debriefed the 2023 data. We noticed that between 60%-75% of our scholar targeted for proficiency were able to meet their goal. This told us that with an additional focus on small group instruction to our stronger level of instruction during core, we would be able to increase the level of targeted scholars meeting their goals. We believe that a consistent and aligned instructional practice for small group times will better meet the ongoing needs of all learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By December 2023 scholars will perform at the following levels in each content area:

ELA - 40%

G3 ELA - 45%

Math - 45%

Science - 50%

ELA Growth - 50%

Math Growth - 50%

ELA L25 Growth - 50%

Math L25 Growth - 50%

By May 2024 scholars will be at the following levels in each content area

ELA - 50%

G3 ELA - 50%

Math - 50%

Science - 50%

ELA Growth - 60%

Math Growth - 60%

ELA L25 Growth - 60%

Math L25 Growth - 60%

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored weekly by school ILT members as well as in PLC meetings. Monitoring will include scholar assessment scores, teacher input and weekly walkthrough observational trends focused on Small Group Instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Boulanger (boulangerc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our small group core support as well as small group intervention support will be guided by the principles of formative assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Formative assessment, when used to guide instructional decisions and scholar intervention is a powerful tool to ensure scholars are receiving instruction at their specific level in an ongoing capacity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

ILT will develop site specific guidelines to define what small group core support and small group intervention is. ILT will also develop guidelines for when both small group core support and small group intervention should be taking place within the instructional day. ILT, along with instructional team members will also develop guidelines for what instructional resources should be used during this time.

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

By When: By August 11th 2023, guidance will be completed and shared with instructional team members.

PD/PLC will be held with all instructional staff to ensure clarity of guidelines and expectations for both small group core and small group intervention groups. In addition, admin and MTSS coach will lead PD/PLC on data analysis with a focus on grouping scholars by need effectively and in an ongoing manner.

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

By When: By September 29th, 2023 100% of classrooms will be implementing Small Group Core Support and Small Group Intervention plan.

ILT will implement bi-weekly check-in process within the structure of PLC to ensure ongoing conversation and use of data to form targeted groups.

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

By When: By September 29th, 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By December of 2023 Progress Monitoring data in ELA will indicate our Students with Disabilities are performing equal to or above the school average.

By December of 2023 Progress Monitoring data in Math will indicate our Students with Disabilities are performing equal to or above the school average.

By May of 2024 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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Weekly Exit Slip monitoring to track scholar progress towards meeting IEP goals. ESE Instructional team will develop weekly progress monitoring checks that connect to both IEP goals and grade level content. Data will be analyzed to allow for formative decisions to be made.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This specific strategy was chosen to increase the level of monitoring for scholars in our ESE programming past grade level common assessments and teacher observation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Admin will meet with ESE Team to share expectations of Weekly Exit slips that connect to BOTH IEP goals and grade level content being supported.

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

By When: By August 31st, admin will meet with ESE Instructional team

ESE Team will develop, with Admin support, way of work to both develop and track scholar performance data on Weekly Exit Slips

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

By When: By September 15th, 2023

Admin and ESE Team will have bi-weekly meetings to review data and discuss effectiveness of instruction.

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

By When: By September 15th, 2023

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 2023 Progress Monitoring data in ELA will indicate our African American scholars are performing equal to or above the school average.

By December of 2023 Progress Monitoring data in Math will indicate our African American scholars are performing equal to or above the school average.

By May of 2024 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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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: Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

By When: August 31st, 2023

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: Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

By When: August 31st, 2023

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

NHES tends to have a concerning number of scholars missing >10% and >20% of school. Attendance is a key indicator of scholar academic success

Measurable Outcome:

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

NHES will have an attendance rate of >95% throughout the 23-24 SY

Monitoring:

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

Through biweekly meetings CST and Admin teams will monitor scholar attendance

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Robles (robles-goodricha@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Scholars identified as missing >10% and or >20% of school days will be assigned a mentor that will communicate directly with the classroom teacher and home.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Assigning mentors that will act as that scholars point of contact for attendance will help streamline our process and ensure ALL scholars that are struggling to meet attendance expectations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Admin will schedule separate attendance monitoring meeting on CST off weeks.

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

By When: 8/31/2023

Admin team will design formal process for assigning scholars to individual mentors and monitoring process to ensure scholars are accounted for at ALL times.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 9/29/23

Admin will schedule separate attendance monitoring meeting on CST off weeks.

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

By When: 8/31/2023

Admin team will design formal process for assigning scholars to individual mentors and monitoring process to ensure scholars are accounted for at ALL times.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 9/29/23

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently. New Heights Elementary School will reserve one, monthly ILT meeting to discuss SIP allocation and resource effectiveness. We will utilize scholar performance data as well and ILT walkthrough trend data to make formative decisions.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

Strategically focus on fully implementing the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative by focusing on VKP-2 classrooms ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Incorporating PELI model into G3 scholars curriculum.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

New Heights scholars in GK-G2 will have 50% of scholars scoring on grade level on the STAR Assessment by May of 2024

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

New Heights Scholars in G3-G5 will have 50% of scholars performing at a Level 3 or higher

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Bi-Weekly grade level walk-throughs specifically related to PELI strategies with feedback.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boulangier, Christopher, boulangerc@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

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

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

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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>o Literacy Leadership ? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. ? School Literacy Leadership teams support the full implementation of the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative in grades VPK-2. ? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches, and district staff who can support training in understanding how high-quality instructional materials connect to evidence-based practices and the B.E.S.T standards. ? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family-friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection.</p>	<p>Boulanger, Christopher, boulangerc@pcsb.org</p>
<p>? Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning outlined by the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative around evidence-based practices grounded in the science of reading as well as the UFLC Flamingo Small group model to demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes. ? Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily.</p>	<p>Ditata, Sharon, ditatas@pcsb.org</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School SIP and progress information will be shared through the school website as well as Title Annual Meetings. In addition, for the 2023-2024 school year stakeholders will be updated and informed using our monthly Community Update.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

New Heights will continue to build and foster positive relationships through the use of Monthly Parent town halls as well as data nights where parents are informed of scholar progress and set goals to become more involved in their education.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Through the methods of weekly PLC and staff meetings as well as any other ongoing PD as needed, New Heights will be in a constant cycle of review and improvement to ensure the needs of our scholars are being met.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No