

Pinellas County Schools

New Heights Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

New Heights Elementary School

3901 37TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

<http://www.tyrone-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Austin G

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: D 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: F
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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 scholar feels valued and successful.

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

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Austin, Lisa Principal	Principal
Boulanger, Christopher Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Panapolis, Meegan Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach
Maxon, Denise Teacher, K-12	Teacher, K-12
Shapiro, Chelsey Teacher, ESE	Teacher, ESE
Bielicki, Marta Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Logan, Greg Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Browne, Norris Other	Other

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	109	108	118	116	110	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	5	3	3	17	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	19	37	69	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	108	82	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263

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		6	19	37	65	48	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	240

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	8	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	32	20	15	19	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	2	13	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	18	39	29	28	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	96	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	1	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	32	20	15	19	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	2	13	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	18	39	29	28	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	96	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	1	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%	54%	57%	36%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	39%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	53%	39%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	33%	61%	63%	41%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	45%	61%	62%	32%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	18%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	40%	53%	53%	36%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	109 (0)	108 (0)	118 (0)	116 (0)	110 (0)	114 (0)	675 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (32)	5 (20)	4 (15)	5 (19)	1 (12)	3 (17)	28 (115)
One or more suspensions	5 (1)	3 (2)	3 (13)	17 (0)	11 (9)	4 (6)	43 (31)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (0)	19 (18)	37 (39)	69 (29)	55 (28)	71 (37)	256 (151)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	108 (71)	82 (96)	73 (105)	263 (272)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	20%	56%	-36%	58%	-38%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
	2018	31%	51%	-20%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	21%	62%	-41%	62%	-41%
	2018	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	64%	-27%	64%	-27%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
	2018	38%	61%	-23%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	21	29	13	22	14	7				
ELL	18	38	47	29	29	19	6				
ASN	52	58		63	50		44				
BLK	16	33	57	26	24	19	14				
HSP	27	34	38	31	23	27	20				
MUL	75	64		38	36						
WHT	42	35	24	47	33	13	47				
FRL	35	39	37	40	31	13	32				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	43
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	63
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	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American 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	48
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Overall Math proficiency showed as lowest performance. This was an 8pt loss when compared to school performance from previous year. Identified contributing factors include: Level of rigor in instruction was low, Instruction was more teacher centered, teacher grade level content knowledge 10/16 teachers were new to grade level (G3-G5)

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was Overall Math proficiency. Factors contributing to decline include: Level of rigor in instruction was low, Instruction was more teacher centered, teacher grade level content knowledge 10/16 teachers were new to grade level (G3-G5)

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

G3 ELA proficiency showed the largest gap in performance when compared with state. Students are not being exposed to grade level text with TDQ to the depth and breadth of

the the standards. Early literacy instruction in primary grades are not meeting the needs of our students and preparing them for more complex reading tasks.

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

Overall Math gains showed a 19pt gain when compared to previous year. Identified actions included: Focused planning sessions where teachers were trained on identifying appropriate rigor of each standard and given planning document to guide their thinking. Students were also given access to iReady supplemental instruction. Lower TPR teacher was utilized through Title I budget to instruct lower performing students in a more purposeful manner

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Upon reviewing the EWS data Course Failures stood out as a concern that needs to be addressed. This indicator showed that approximately 40% of our students in grades K-5 had at least one course failure during the 18-19 school year

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency
2. Increase Math proficiency
3. Reduce student Course Failures
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Engagement
Rationale	Traditionally, at NHES the majority of our scholars struggle to meet grade level proficiency goals and show learning gains on state assessments. This trend is also observed in our ESSA subgroup breakdown as well with 2/8 subgroups listed NOT meeting the Federal Index of > 41.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	With a purposeful focus on Student Engagement NHES will achieve a school grade rating of C or higher. In addition NHES will decrease the number of our ESSA Subgroups performing below 41 from 2 to 0
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities - Professional Development (Achievement Network/Collaborative Planning/District Provided Monthly PD/Site Based Offerings)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	NHES Professional Learning Communities will allow NHES to utilize consultants as well as site based instructional coaches to facilitate professional development that will best meet the needs of ALL learners. Monitoring will take place within structure of Instructional Rounds with planned follow-up.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish site based equity team that will lead staff in professional development to plan for meeting the needs of all learners 2. Work with Achievement Network and Cambio consultancy groups to increase instructional knowledge of content as well as instructional strategies 3. Site based coaches will work with teachers during weekly facilitated planning sessions to ensure the level of instruction is meeting the needs of all scholars 4. Establish Instructional Rounds as way of work with a focus on collecting trend data for student engagement. 5. Leadership team will schedule weekly meetings to discuss observed current status and next steps.
Person Responsible	Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Culture and Climate
Rationale	NHES trend data shows an achievement gap in 2 out of 8 of the reported subgroups. These subgroups include African American and Students with Disabilities. This data indicates a more focused instructional approach to better meeting these students needs. There is also a disproportionate number of these students being given discipline referrals.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	NHES will reduce the number of subgroups performing below 41 from 2 to 0.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities - Pprofessional Development (Achievement Network/Collaborative Planning/ District Provided Monthly PD/Site Based Offerings)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing capacity for instructional staff to create a culture and climate that ensures students needs are being met is. There has been an identified need to increase

Action Step	
Description	1. Establish site based equity team that will lead staff in professional development to plan for meeting the needs of all learners 2. Instructional walk throughs focusing on classroom climate looking for trends. 3. Monthly meetings providing feedback and growth steps.
Person Responsible	Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Culture and Climate	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00