

The School District of Lee County

# Harlem Heights Community Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>22</b>

# Harlem Heights Community Charter School

15570 HAGIE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://heightscharterschool.org/>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 8/2/2023.

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

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

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

## School Leadership Team, 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
Mathinos, Deb	Principal	

**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.

Teachers, parents and community leaders are invited to attend School Accountability Team meetings to provide input into the creation of the School Improvement Plan. Parents are also asked to provide feedback to the plan developed by the SAT before plan finalization.

**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))

The School Accountability Team holds the responsibility for monitoring implementation of the SIP. This group meets quarterly during the school year as well as once over the Summer. Data from student performance on State Progress Monitoring assessments as well as school-based data (iReady, student grades) is considered by the SAT when evaluating the impact of the SIP activities on increasing student achievement. This group also recommends modifications to the annual SIP as needed throughout the school year.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	94%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	3	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	9	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
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				0	5	3	2	5	4	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.				0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	5	3	2	5	4	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	7

**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	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	36	48	53	44	52	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				66			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				75					
Math Achievement*	39	57	59	40	45	50	21		
Math Learning Gains				70			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	22	53	54	24	59	59	18		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	51	59	63			53		

\* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD				
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	37	Yes	1	

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD				
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	57			

**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	36			39			22					60
SWD												
ELL	28			33			15				4	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	37			43			23				5	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34			39			18				5	61

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	44	66	75	40	70	77	24					63
SWD												
ELL	41	68		42	71							63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45	67	73	41	72	77	22					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	44	66	75	40	70	77	24					63

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	45		21	24		18					53
SWD												
ELL	27			17	20							53

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	34	50		21	21		20					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32	45		21	24		18					53

**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	42%	48%	-6%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	21%	42%	-21%	50%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	59%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	20%	50%	-30%	51%	-31%

### 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.**

Students, regardless of grade level or subgroup, continue to struggle with the academic vocabulary required for expected proficiency levels of State assessments. This limited vocabulary development adversely impacts performance on reading, math and science tests.

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

Vocabulary and critical analysis of the written word. A large percentage of our students are not native English speakers and have limited practical knowledge of academic vocabulary, specifically, and English vocabulary, in general. Few students have access to reading materials outside of the school day and have limited opportunity to develop critical reading skills. This limited access to materials outside of school was worsened by Hurricane Ian, with over 70% of the student body losing all their family possessions in the storm.

**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.**

Vocabulary and critical analysis of the written word. A large percentage of our students are not native English speakers and have limited practical knowledge of academic vocabulary, specifically, and English vocabulary, in general. Few students have access to reading materials outside of the school day and have limited opportunity to develop critical reading skills. While some improvement has been seen in vocabulary development, the students continue to test at a level approximately 1 full year behind expected levels.

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

Vocabulary development and writing. This improvement can be attributed to the more deliberate and systematic teaching of vocabulary across all grade levels, and increasing the amount and types of writing all students completed across the curriculum. Additionally, increasing instructional time to include after school tutoring for a larger number of students helped bring about improvement in these areas.

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

Vocabulary development and critical analysis of the written word remain concerns.

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

Increase general and academic vocabulary as well as critical reading/writing skills.

#### Area of Focus

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

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****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.

As a majority of students underperforming on the state assessments are second language learners, this subgroup demonstrates the greatest need for additional support and intervention to facilitate achievement of expected proficiency levels.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

70% of LY students will demonstrate improved proficiency on State progress monitoring assessments in the area of English Language Arts.

**Monitoring:**

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

Baseline data at the start of the school year, and progress monitoring (3 times/year) of student skill proficiency will be used to monitor achievement of desired outcome. Data will be obtained through state progress monitoring and iReady progress monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**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.)

To support the school-wide Fountas and Pinnel Leveled Literacy instruction, extended instructional time (after school tutoring) and the use of supplemental instructional programs (Tiny Ivy, IXL, iReady, FastForward) will be implemented to support the acceleration of literacy skill development in the LY student population.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school as a whole has adopted Fountas and Pinnel Leveled Literacy Instruction to support struggling readers. This program is rated as a Strong program in terms of ESSA evidence-based programs Extended ELA instructional time is needed to ameliorate the limited educational experiences students encountered prior to beginning school in the US, as well as tempering the lack of educational experiences available to students outside of the school day. The educational impact of regular use of iReady and FastForward has been the

subject of research with a wide variety of positive findings for the acceleration of skill development. For example, there is research-based evidence that consistent 45 minutes/week on iReady results in academic growth in excess of one school year.

**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.

Identify students in need of additional support/extended learning time.

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 31, 2023

Enroll students in supplemental programs (iReady, IXL, Fast Forward)

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** September 1, 2023

Establish schedule for supplemental/extended learning time.

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** September 1, 2023

Identify and train staff providing supplemental/extended instructional time.

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** September 1, 2023

Monitor student performance on supplemental programs.

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** every 6 weeks



## #2. 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.

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

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year will be reduced by 33% over the course of the 2023-24 academic year.

### Monitoring:

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

Monthly attendance monitoring

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

### 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.)

Students demonstrating a pattern of unexcused absences will be referred to the Masters level Clinical Social Worker contracted for services by the school. This individual will work with parents to identify underlying causes of student absences and develop an individualized plan for the family.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Most student absences arise from underlying stressors impacting family functioning. The provision of resources and support to these families (via the Master's level Clinical Social Worker) will help ameliorate the underlying conditions and result in improved family functioning. This improvement will allow for more regular and consistent student attendance.

### 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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

### 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.

Identify students with historical record of excessive absences.

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 18, 2023

Refer students identified with historical excessive absences to Social Worker; refer newly identified students to Social Worker at end of each month

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 18, 2023; end of each subsequent month

Monthly monitoring of student attendance

**Person Responsible:** Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

**By When:** end of each month beginning August 31

### **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).

The annual budget identifying predicted expenditures associated with purchase of supplemental programs and personnel costs to extend instructional time (after school programming) was shared with the School Accountability Team during the development of the School Improvement Plans. Funding available from Title I, Mental Health Allocation, and ARPA grants was also considered in the determination of adequate funding for planned activities.

### **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**

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

### 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

#### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

### 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.

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

### 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?

#### 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?

### 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**

## 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.

The School Accountability Team, consisting of teachers, administrators, parents and community members, meets regularly to analyze data from parent surveys, workshop/training evaluations and summary student achievement data. Using this data analysis, the SAT develops a list of recommendations for improving parent programs, improving instructional programs and identifying new areas to be addressed to increase family involvement in support of student achievement. The School Accountability Team is responsible for creation, implementation and distribution of the School Improvement Plan as well as the Parent-School Compact and Parent Engagement Plan. The SIP is made available to all families at the annual Title I Night as well as being posted on the school website ([www.heightscharterschool.org](http://www.heightscharterschool.org)).

**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))

The school distributes information about Title I and general instructional programs to parents in a format and language accessible by the parents. Monthly newsletters including upcoming activities, meetings and important dates are provided in both English and Spanish. This information is also posted on the School website. The school provides an overview of standards and grade level curriculum at the beginning of the year Open House. In addition, the school utilizes a standards-based report card. The report card, and specific standard expectations, is explained in more detail to parents/families at parent-teacher conferences in October, and at Student - Led conferences in March. Each teacher sends home a folder containing student papers and work samples on a weekly basis. Teachers also routinely contact

families on an individual basis to communicate information regarding student progress. Interim reports and report cards are also provided to parents. In the event parents have found the school-wide plan unsatisfactory, they will be provided contact information for the Lee County School District Title I office. Parents are invited to participate in meetings for the review and development of the School Improvement Plan, Parent Engagement Plan and Parent-School Compact. Parents receive these invitations via monthly newsletter and flyers sent home in both English and Spanish. The participants review the existing plans and recommend changes for the upcoming school year. In the event it is not possible for a parent to attend these meetings, copies of the specific plans are posted on the school website. Parents are emailed and asked to review the proposed plans and provide their input either through return email comments or by calling the school.

Finally, parental input into programming is obtained through surveys completed in Spring as well as through comments provided on workshop and training evaluations.

**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)**

The incorporation of evidence-based supplemental programs and the increased instructional time arising from an expanded after school tutoring program are intended to help close the achievement gap demonstrated by our students.

**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))**

IDEA (Students with Disabilities): All programs and activities will seek to educate families on how to provide home support to students falling under IDEA so that these children can increase their level of success.

ESOL/ELL (Title III): All programs and activities will be available to all parents. All invitations, flyers, and messages are translated into Spanish.

The school, in collaboration with The Heights Center, offers a program called Teach.Learn.Connect. This program provides monthly classes to parents to help them develop the skills needed to support their children's academic development. Classes are taught by charter school staff, who work first with parents on skills and then in the final 20 minutes of each session, guides parents as they implement the skills with their child. Additionally, once every quarter a family program is offered on such topics as literacy development, writing, mathematical development, or positive behavior support.

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

The school contracts with a Master's level clinical social worker to provide on-site counseling services, small group social skills instruction and more generalized decision making classes to primary level classrooms. The fact that her office is located in an adjoining building to the school allows her to respond to student needs quickly as they arise, and allows her

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

As an elementary school, postsecondary programming is limited. Fifth graders do complete an initial career exploration unit as part of their regular course curriculum.

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

All students in Grades K-5 (approximately 170 students) are screened for Social/Emotional Health using the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire. The school utilizes the PATH (Promoting Alternatives for Thinking Skills) curriculum in all grade levels. Additionally, a School-Wide Behavioral Intervention and Support system is in place as part of school's MTSS process. Students already possessing a mental health diagnosis or who are newly identified as at risk for mental health issues based on their screening results participate in weekly 45-minute Social Skills small group classes run by the Masters Level Clinical Social Worker (contracted by the school). As appropriate to the child's needs, a Functional Behavioral Analysis is conducted for students in Tier 2 to more accurately identify underlying concerns that require intervention. Students receiving Tier 2 support may also have a Behavioral Contract or Behavioral Intervention Plan implemented for additional support. Students needing Tier 3 intervention are referred to area medical services and mental health agencies for additional support as needed.

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

Staff development topics focus almost exclusively on evidence-based strategies for strengthening literacy skills in economically disadvantaged and LY learners. Monthly staff meetings focus on data review and analysis leading to the identification of students in greatest need for additional supports. Recruitment of teachers also emphasizes professionals with experience and a passion for teaching the "difficult to teach" students.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

The school's Kindergarten classes hold an "open house" for student in the VPK program located on the same site as the charter school. Close communication between the Kindergarten and VPK teachers helps in planning effective transition from early education to primary education.

**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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00

	<b>Total:</b> <b>\$0.00</b>
--	-----------------------------

**Budget Approval**

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

Yes