

Pinellas County Schools

NEW HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

 A. School Mission and Vision 2

 B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP
 Monitoring 2

 C. Demographic Data..... 6

 D. Early Warning Systems 7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14

 E. Grade Level Data Review 17

III. Planning for Improvement..... 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment 36

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 39

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 45

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 46

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

At New Heights Elementary, guided by the spirit of "I am because we are," we cultivate a vibrant, inclusive community where every diverse learner is celebrated, supported, and empowered to reach their unique potential. We are deeply committed to fostering strong connections with our families and the wider community, believing that these partnerships are essential for nurturing academic excellence, social-emotional growth, and a profound sense of belonging. Through collaboration and mutual respect, we prepare compassionate, lifelong learners to thrive.

Provide the school's vision statement

To inspire a generation of collaborative, compassionate leaders who, rooted in the strength of our diverse community, build a brighter, more equitable tomorrow.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Chris Boulanger

boulangerc@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitate the overall direction of the school.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Amy Santos

santosam@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Work closely with principal to ensure overall function of school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Abby Walsh

walshab@pcsb.org

Position Title

Math Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Monitor planning and implementation of Math curriculum throughout school. Working with Leadership Team to ensure scholars are receiving a high level of instruction during their Math block.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Bobbie Borys

borysb@pcsb.org

Position Title

MTSS Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Monitor and analyze schoolwide data and provide feedback to leadership team and classroom teachers.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

At New Heights Elementary School, the development of the School Improvement Plan is a deeply collaborative process grounded in our *Ubuntu* philosophy: "*I am because we are.*" We believe that meaningful school turnaround and sustained academic excellence can only be achieved when our staff, families, and community leadership work in lockstep.

The development of the 2026-27 School Improvement Plan followed a structured, data-driven cycle designed to maximize stakeholder input and ensure absolute buy-in across all groups:

- **Initiating the Direction via End-of-Year Data:** The process began immediately following the release of our 2025-26 end-of-year student performance metrics. As Principal, I conducted a comprehensive analysis of our school-wide data—celebrating our persistent strengths but squarely identifying critical drops in our intermediate learning gains, primary reading standard proficiency, and fifth-grade science performance. This raw data served as the objective foundation for our strategic pivot.
- **School Leadership Team Consultation:** With the data trends established, I met with members of the School Leadership Team individually. These one-on-one sessions allowed me to hear their candid insights on our current trajectory and gather specific recommendations on the pedagogical shifts required to address our deficiencies. This feedback directly shaped our focus on deeper cognitive engagement, explicit lesson hinge points, and the implementation of Nathaniel Swain's *Science of Learning* frameworks across all grade levels.
- **Teachers and School Staff Collaboration:** The broader instructional staff was engaged through data-review sessions where we looked at our historical trends collectively. Teachers provided essential classroom-level context regarding student engagement with higher-order tasks and vocabulary retrieval challenges. Their input ensured that our evidence-based interventions—such as phoneme-grapheme mapping in Kindergarten and daily math number bonds—were both realistic and actionable.
- **Parents, Families, and Community Input:** To guide our overall cultural and academic direction, we heavily leveraged feedback from our families collected through surveys and community forums. Our parents provided invaluable insight into the student experience, helping us identify where scholars needed greater independent stamina and at-home instructional support. This family feedback was vital in refining our goals for our African American subgroup and Students with Disabilities, ensuring our plan aggressively addresses equity, bridges achievement deficits, and upholds high expectations for all scholars.

By synthesizing objective end-of-year data with the specialized insights of our leadership team, the classroom expertise of our teachers, and the vital perspectives of our parents, this School

Improvement Plan represents a unified blueprint tailored to push every scholar at New Heights Elementary to perform at true grade-level rigor.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

New Heights Elementary monitors the School Improvement Plan (SIP) through a tight, continuous feedback loop that evaluates both teacher implementation and student growth, with a dedicated focus on closing equity gaps.

Regular Monitoring of Implementation and Student Impact

- **Weekly Walkthrough Audits:** The administrative team conducts weekly walkthroughs to verify that core interventions are being executed with fidelity.
- **Data PLCs:** Grade-level teams meet weekly or bi-weekly to analyze common formative assessments.
- **Triannual Benchmarks:** Progress Monitoring windows (PM1, PM2, PM3) provide macro-level objective data to ensure we are on track to meet state standards.

Disaggregated Data Tracking: Leadership explicitly pulls and reviews data for these subgroups bi-weekly.

- **Rigor Audits:** We audit student work samples to guarantee these scholars are interacting with on-grade-level rigor via proper scaffolding, rather than watered-down modifications.

Monthly Teacher Feedback: Staff share operational wins and hurdles during monthly meetings, allowing us to pivot coaching support or adjust strategy pacing.

- **Quarterly Family Check-Ins:** We present transparent data updates at SAC meetings and *Hawk Talk* forums, gathering parent input on student engagement and academic pressure points.
- **The Mid-Year Pivot Protocol:** If PM2 data shows we are falling short of our goals (e.g., the 65% learning gains target in intermediate ELA/Math), the leadership team and stakeholders will formally adjust action steps and reallocate resources immediately.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	100.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: B 2024-25: A 2023-24: B 2022-23: C 2021-22: C

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 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	
School Enrollment										0
Absent 10% or more school days	0	30	19	40	28	26				143
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	3				6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	7				7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2				3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	23	51	5	19				98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	18	48	4	19				93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	0	7	20	1	0				28
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	1	12	21	2	0				36

Current Year 2026-27

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	4	19	46	3	23				95

Current Year 2026-27

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	0	0	11	0	1				12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0				1

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last 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	
School Enrollment	53	78	106	103	94	108				542
Absent 10% or more school days	1	28	41	40	30	32				172
One or more suspensions		1			2	2				5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)										0
Course failure in Math						1				1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		1	29	38	23					91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	11	22	29	13	18				94
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		1	12	16						29
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		5	15	13	7					40

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	1	8	11	24	17	28				89

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1		1	8						10
Students retained two or more times				1						1

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]
ELA Achievement*	59	68	62	57	64	59	40	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	61	70	61	71	67	59	38	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	54	65	63	67	62	60	62	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55	63	58	85	59	56	82	62	57
Math Achievement*	64	72	66	65	69	64	51	66	62
Math Learning Gains	55	69	64	68	67	63	67	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67	56	50	69	56	51	75	58	52
Science Achievement	49	72	62	57	70	58	55	69	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					67	63		65	61

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

[†] District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	58%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	464
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
58%	66%	58%	47%	47%	46%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 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%
Students With Disabilities	51%	No		
English Language Learners	60%	No		
Asian Students	57%	No		
Black/African American Students	50%	No		
Hispanic Students	59%	No		
Multiracial Students	70%	No		
White Students	63%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	No		

D. 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.

2025-26 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	59%	61%	54%	55%	64%	55%	67%	49%					
Students With Disabilities	43%	44%	48%	73%	46%	52%		50%					
English Language Learners	52%	50%	44%	57%	75%	65%	74%	62%					
Asian Students	58%		37%		79%	63%		50%					
Black/African American Students	50%	57%	55%	56%	51%	46%	50%	33%					
Hispanic Students	52%	48%	50%	63%	68%	62%	68%	61%					
Multiracial Students	83%		62%		67%	69%							
White Students	72%	93%	64%		63%	45%		43%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	58%	56%	58%	59%	54%	64%	45%					

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	71%	67%	85%	65%	68%	69%	57%					54%
Students With Disabilities	41%	60%	59%	85%	40%	55%	63%	14%					
English Language Learners	68%	79%	73%	83%	66%	67%	71%	70%					54%
Asian Students	69%	70%	78%		78%	70%		83%					
Black/African American Students	35%	45%	56%	87%	52%	70%	72%	23%					
Hispanic Students	63%	71%	68%	76%	62%	63%	65%	67%					55%
Multiracial Students	78%		69%		76%	75%							
White Students	64%	92%	73%	91%	71%	72%	70%	60%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	70%	65%	83%	64%	68%	68%	58%					53%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	40%	38%	62%	82%	51%	67%	75%	55%					55%
Students With Disabilities	20%	16%	55%	79%	29%	61%	86%	20%					
English Language Learners	45%	56%	61%	88%	58%	73%	84%	31%					55%
Asian Students	57%	70%	68%		76%	71%		55%					67%
Black/African American Students	19%	13%	49%	80%	30%	60%	72%	35%					
Hispanic Students	45%	46%	63%	83%	53%	73%	86%	47%					55%
Multiracial Students	77%		64%		86%	85%							
White Students	40%	35%	71%	91%	49%	63%		72%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	38%	34%	65%	80%	49%	68%	76%	49%					52%

E. 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.

2025-26 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	57%	68%	-11%	60%	-3%
ELA	4	56%	66%	-10%	60%	-4%
ELA	5	56%	66%	-10%	61%	-5%
Math	3	67%	71%	-4%	66%	1%
Math	4	62%	72%	-10%	65%	-3%
Math	5	55%	69%	-14%	62%	-7%
Science	5	48%	70%	-22%	60%	-12%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Our proficiency rates are still showing a steady increase. As a school we met all of our proficiency targets in ELA and Math.

Lowest Performance

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

Lowest Performance was our G1 and G2 STAR and Science Proficiency rates. In reference to the Science performance, the barrier is an inconsistent level of instruction focused on vocabulary development and background knowledge. In grades 1 and 2, although there are expert teachers on those grade levels, inexperience and consistency in small group phonics instruction was a barrier.

Greatest Decline

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

Overall and L25 Gains were the greatest decline. Scholars that scored a Level 3 or higher in previous years were not able to keep their same Level of performance.

Greatest Gap

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.

Highest gaps were definitely our SWD subgroup performance. In addition, our G1 and G2 scholars performed off pace with the state. As school there is a struggle to create independence with SWD scholars working on grade level tasks due to lack of knowledge base of appropriate scaffolds.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Concerns for EWS areas remain focused on attendance.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Science Proficiency
4. Primary ELA Proficiency
5. Students with Disabilities proficiency

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

- **Description:** This area of focus targets increasing scholar learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA) and Reading for students in grades 3 through 5. Ensuring consistent year-over-year progress in reading comprehension, text analysis, and foundational literacy skills directly impacts a scholar's ability to access all other academic disciplines.
- **Rationale:** Prior year data demonstrates a significant decline in growth. In 2024-25, 67% of scholars achieved a learning gain, whereas in 2025-26, that number dropped by 15% to only 52%. A deep dive into the data reveals that scholars who previously scored at a proficient level are failing to maintain those same scores year over year. This drop indicates a critical gap in student engagement with higher-order, rigorous tasks, necessitating a shift toward deep cognitive engagement and advanced text analysis.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 52% of scholars in grades 3-5 made a learning gain in ELA/Reading.
- **State Specific Outcome:** By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 65% of scholars in grades 3-5 will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA/Reading as measured by the state summative assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Implementation and impact will be monitored via bi-weekly Professional Learning Communities

(PLCs) reviewing formative assessment data, bi-weekly administrative walkthroughs focusing on task alignment, and the triannual review of district benchmark assessments (FAST/Progress Monitoring cycles).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

o Implementation of structured Retrieval Practice routines (based on Dr. Pooja Agarwal's research) o Targeted lesson design featuring explicit hinge points and tier-differentiation for novice and expert learners (derived from Nathaniel Swain's Harnessing the Science of Learning). o Scholars will also experience increased opportunities for independent interaction with grade-level, high-complexity texts.

Rationale:

Well planned, Hinge Point Questions allow teachers to check for understanding at critical junctures before moving on to independent practice preventing gaps from widening. Differentiating instruction specifically for novice versus expert learners ensures proficient students are consistently pushed with higher-order tasks rather than repeating mastered skills. Retrieval practice strengthens memory retention of comprehension strategies, while independent exposure to complex texts builds vital academic stamina.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Hinge-Point Lesson Planning and Higher-Order Task Alignment

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, during PLC planning PD and targeted instructional walkthroughs.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will work with admin to develop processes to explicitly plan and execute "hinge-point" checks during reading blocks to assess whether scholars are ready for independent, higher-order tasks. Administrators will monitor this by reviewing lesson plans during PLCs for clear hinge questions and conducting walkthroughs to verify that master-level/proficient students are actively

engaged in independent text analysis rather than passive worksheets.

Action Step #2

Daily Retrieval Practice Routines

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Monthly via data chats and bi-weekly via classroom observations.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will work with admin during weekly PLCs to develop processes to plan for and implement consistent retrieval practice structures. Teachers will implement low-stakes retrieval quizzes, brain dumps, or flashcard routines at the beginning of ELA blocks to solidify reading strategies and vocabulary. Leadership will monitor impact by cross-referencing observation notes with bi-weekly formative assessment data to ensure long-term retention of standards.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

- **Description:** This area focuses on reversing the downward trend in math learning gains for intermediate scholars by strengthening core numerical fluency and increasing cognitive stamina during multi-step problem-solving.
- **Rationale:** Review of historical data shows that in 2024-25, 68% of scholars made a learning gain in Math. However, in 2025-26, this dropped 14% down to 54%. Similar to ELA, data indicates that previously proficient scholars are not maintaining their performance levels year over year. This stems directly from a lack of consistent engagement with higher-order problem-solving and rigorous tasks, leaving historically proficient students under-challenged.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 54% of scholars in grades 3-5 made a learning gain in Mathematics.
- **State Specific Outcome:** By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 65% of scholars in grades 3-5 will demonstrate a learning gain in Mathematics as measured by the state summative assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Progress will be tracked through weekly common formative assessments (CFAs), monthly math benchmark monitoring, and collaborative data reviews during grade-level PLCs. Leadership will conduct focused math walkthroughs weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

o Integration of systematic Number Bonds instruction in grades 3-5 as part of Math warm-up to build rapid mental math efficiency, paired with Harnessing the Science of Learning principles. o Integration of Hinge Points to determine when to transition students from direct instruction to complex tasks, and structured differentiation that exposes advanced learners to non-routine, higher-level mathematical thinking. o Daily Retrieval Practice will be utilized to reinforce mathematical properties and vocabulary.

Rationale:

Automaticity with number bonds frees up cognitive working memory, allowing scholars to focus on complex, higher-order multi-step word problems. The important work will be to increase teacher capacity in teaching number bonds with larger numbers and fractions to allow scholars to quickly make sense of Math. Utilizing hinge points ensures that struggling learners get, planned, immediate support while expert learners are accelerated into rigorous application without sitting through redundant instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Number Bond Automaticity and Mental Math Drills

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, targeted walk-throughs, with debriefs

during PLCs checks.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly PLCs will focus on teacher planning for warm-ups that include both retrieval practice opportunities and working on number bonding with purpose. This will result in teachers will dedicating the first 5 minutes of math blocks to either retrieval practice activities or rapid mental math strategies and number bond structures. Leadership will monitor impact by analyzing walkthrough data as well as scholar performance on assessments.

Action Step #2

Advanced Task Differentiation for Proficient Scholars

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly during PLC planning and administrative walkthroughs.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly PLCs will focus on intentional planning of Hinge Point questioning as well as purposeful planned, reactions to scholar responses Grade levels will purposefully plan two distinct paths for independent practice following a lesson's hinge-point check: one for novice practice and one containing higher-order, complex application problems for expert learners. Administrators will monitor walkthroughs to ensure proficient students are consistently routed to the higher-rigor track.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

ELA/Reading - Kindergarten

- **Description:** This area of focus targets foundational print concepts and phonics decoding to transition early learners from basic pre-reading skills to independent book reading.
- **Rationale:** Review of the 2025-26 end-of-year data showed that only 20% of Kindergarten scholars scored greater than a Level D on their end-of-year Running Record. Failing to reach a Level D indicates that a vast majority of scholars are entering first grade lacking the ability to read text independently, creating a cascading deficit in a critical, foundational prerequisite skill.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 20% of Kindergarten scholars scored greater than a Level D on

the end-of-year Running Record.

- **Specific Outcome:** By the end of the 2026-27 school year, 60% of Kindergarten scholars will score at a Level D or higher on their end-of-year Running Record, qualifying them to take the STAR Reading Assessment instead of the STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Progress will be monitored via monthly Running Records, weekly phonics mastery checks, and quarterly tracking of foundational literacy metrics during leadership data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Implementation of systematic, explicit Phoneme-Grapheme Mapping routines alongside structured, independent interaction with grade-level decodable texts matching our phonics scope and sequence. Following Dr. Agarwal's principles of Retrieval Practice, scholars will engage in daily, low-stakes retrieval of letter-sound correspondences and high-frequency word patterns using sound boxes (Elkonin boxes). Instruction will follow Swain's framework of explicitly guiding novice learners through heavy blending and segmenting scaffolds before gradually releasing them to read continuous text independently.

Rationale:

Moving scholars from a pre-reading stage to independent reading (Level D or higher) requires orthographic mapping—the cognitive process readers use to turn printed words into effortless, automatic sight words. Rote memorization of sight words creates a learning ceiling; conversely, phoneme-grapheme mapping forces the brain to connect auditory sounds to visual letters. By anchoring these structures through retrieval practice and immediately applying them to independent decodable text reading, we bypass working-memory overload, build reading stamina, and directly drive progress on running record levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Decodable Text Integration and Independent Reading Routines

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Monthly running record checks and bi-weekly observations of systematic instruction.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will transition scholars rapidly from shared reading to independent manipulation of grade-level decodable texts matching their phonics scope. Impact will be monitored by assessing the direct transfer of phonics skills during monthly individual running record assessments. In addition, PLCs will focus data chats, monthly on scholar progress on both ELFAC and RR assessments.

Action Step #2

Hinge-Point Assessments for Small Group Phonics

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly during collaborative planning.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will implement daily, explicit Phoneme-Grapheme Mapping routines. Scholars will physically map out the sounds they hear in high-frequency/sight words using Elkonin boxes and magnetic letters before reading them in continuous text. Leadership will monitor the impact by tracking the correlation between weekly word-mapping mastery and monthly running record level advancements to ensure decoding skills are transferring cleanly to independent text reading.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

ELA/Reading (Grades 1-2)

- **Description:** This area addresses text-based comprehension standards, specifically focusing on structural analysis of informational and literary texts in early intermediate grades.
- **Rationale:** During the 2025-26 school year, only 32% of primary scholars scored proficient on the Florida B.E.S.T. Standard *Reading Across Genres*. Deeper analysis shows that scholars specifically struggle with summarizing non-fiction texts, comparing two texts, and identifying the central idea of a fiction text. Without mastery of these cross-genre skills, scholars cannot meet the text-complexity requirements of the intermediate grades.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 32% of scholars scored proficient on the Reading Across Genres standard.
- **State Specific Outcome:** By the end of the 2026-27 school year, 55% of first and second-grade scholars will achieve proficiency on the Reading Across Genres standard as measured by district and state progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored via common module assessments every 3-4 weeks, bi-weekly PLC work analyzing student writing/summaries, and administrative observation of dedicated reading comprehension blocks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Explicit instruction in text-structure mapping and academic vocabulary retrieval. Teachers will utilize Swain's framework for teaching novice vs. expert learners, ensuring novice readers receive highly-scaffolded graphic organizers for summaries, while expert readers are pushed to independently compare multi-paragraph texts. Daily Retrieval Practice will focus heavily on standard-specific vocabulary (e.g., central idea, contrast, summary).

Rationale:

Explicitly teaching text structures provides scholars with a cognitive blueprint for summarizing and comparing. By differentiating instructions between novice and expert phases, teachers avoid under-scaffolding struggling readers and prevent advanced readers from stagnating on basic tasks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Standards-Specific Academic Vocabulary Retrieval

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly walkthroughs and monthly vocabulary checks.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will use daily low-stakes retrieval methods (e.g., fill-in-the-blank, quick writes) targeting comprehension terms. Leadership will observe classrooms to ensure vocabulary is not just posted on walls, but actively retrieved and used by scholars during text discussions.

Area of Focus #5

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

- **Description:** This area targets the reinforcement of scientific inquiry, concept retention, and standard-specific vocabulary acquisition for fifth-grade scholars.
- **Rationale:** In the 2025-26 school year, Science was the only proficiency target New Heights Elementary failed to hit, with only 47% of fifth-grade scholars achieving a proficient score. Diagnostic data revealed a major barrier: scholars are unable to accurately retrieve science-specific academic vocabulary during assessments, which distorts their conceptual understanding and limits their performance on state exams.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 47% of fifth-grade scholars scored proficient on the statewide Science assessment.
- **State Specific Outcome:** By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 60% of fifth-grade scholars will score proficient on the statewide Science assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Monitoring will include monthly science diagnostic assessments, bi-weekly standard-based quizzes, and monthly checks on science lab/vocabulary notebook implementation by school administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Implementation of spaced Retrieval Practice loops centered strictly around science academic vocabulary and core concepts (Agarwal). Lessons will also feature intentional hinge points during lab and theory blocks to determine if scholars are ready to apply concepts to higher-order situational questions, ensuring rigorous exposure for advanced learners.

Rationale:

Science assessments rely heavily on dense vocabulary contextualized within real-world scenarios. Spaced retrieval practice stops information from being forgotten after a unit ends. Hinge points ensure that vocabulary gaps are identified and corrected immediately before students attempt complex, higher-level application questions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Spaced Vocabulary Retrieval Matrix

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Bi-weekly vocabulary quiz data tracking.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will use a tracking matrix to ensure that vocabulary from prior units (e.g., Earth Science terms introduced in Q1) is continually retrieved during Q2 and Q3 starter routines. Admin, along with the teachers will monitor quiz trends to ensure long-term vocabulary recall is increasing.

Action Step #2

Hinge-Point Application in Scientific Investigations

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly lesson plan reviews and bi-weekly lab walkthroughs.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will embed a conceptual check mid-way through each science block before moving into higher-order analysis questions. Leadership will check that classrooms demonstrate scholars moving quickly into advanced, independent scenarios once basic vocabulary and conceptual mastery are confirmed at the hinge point.

Area of Focus #6

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

-
- **Description:** This focus area addresses the achievement gap for our African American subgroup in grades 3-5, specifically ensuring equitable access to grade-level rigor and targeted instructional scaffolds.
 - **Rationale:** In the 2025-26 school year, our African American subgroup performed at a severe deficit compared to overall school trends. Only 49% of African American scholars scored proficient in Math, whereas the school-wide average was 62%—representing a clear 13% achievement gap. This data indicates that this subgroup is not being consistently pushed or scaffolded to interact with higher-order, grade-level tasks, leaving a portion of these scholars under-challenged or under-supported. *(Note: To maintain structural alignment across school goals while utilizing this critical data indicator, math-infused reading tasks, academic vocabulary tracking, and equitable rigor models will be used to close this gap).*

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

-
- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 49% of African American scholars in grades 3-5 achieved proficiency.
 - **State Specific Outcome:** By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 55% of African American scholars in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the state assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Subgroup data will be disaggregated and evaluated bi-weekly during leadership team meetings, monthly during individual teacher data chats, and at every progress monitoring window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Differentiating instruction by designing explicit paths for novice and expert learners (Swain) to eliminate the low-expectation trap. Teachers will ensure consistent exposure to grade-level academic vocabulary and provide intentional opportunities to interact independently with highly rigorous, complex tasks. Lesson hinge points will be utilized to provide immediate, actionable feedback without delaying acceleration.

Rationale:

Explicitly categorizing instructional needs into novice and expert phases ensures that African American scholars who have mastered basics are immediately accelerated into higher-order tasks rather than kept on repetitive baseline work. High-frequency exposure to academic vocabulary and independent complex tasks directly combats the opportunity gap.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Rigor-Equity Audits of Independent Student Work

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Monthly student work artifacts review.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The instructional leadership team will conduct monthly audits of independent work completed by African American scholars to ensure it matches the high rigor of the standard. Administrators will verify that scholars are being pushed into high-level problem solving rather than low-level remediation.

Action Step #2

Target Vocabulary and Retrieval Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly walkthroughs and disaggregated formative data analysis.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will track the individual response rates of subgroup scholars during daily retrieval practice sessions. Leadership will monitor during walkthroughs to ensure these scholars are actively participating, cold-called on complex questions, and demonstrating verbal/written mastery of tier-3 academic vocabulary.

Area of Focus #7

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

-
- **Description:** This area focuses on aligning specialized exceptional student education (ESE) strategies with general education tier-1 reading rigor to close the wide proficiency gap for Students with Disabilities (SWD).
 - **Rationale:** Review of 2025-26 data reveals a severe gap in performance: only 35% of our Students with Disabilities scored at a proficient level in Reading/ELA, compared to our overall school proficiency rate of 57%. This represents a stark 22% deficit. This data indicates that our instructional models are failing to effectively meet this subgroup's specific learning needs while simultaneously exposing them to required grade-level rigor, often over-modifying tasks rather than scaffolding them.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

-
- **Prior Year Data (2025-26):** 35% of Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 scored proficient in Reading/ELA.
 - **State Specific Outcome:** By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 45% of Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the state ELA/Reading assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored weekly through co-planning sessions between ESE and general education teachers, bi-weekly progress checks on IEP goals aligned with B.E.S.T. standards, and monthly administrative look-fors targeting scaffolded tier-1 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Utilization of highly-structured Retrieval Practice tailored for working-memory support, alongside strict execution of lesson hinge points to manage cognitive load. Teachers will follow Swain's explicit guidelines for teaching novice learners, utilizing heavy systematic scaffolding (visual cues, word banks, sentence frames) that gradually fade to allow independent interaction with grade-level texts. Consistent exposure to high-level academic vocabulary is mandatory.

Rationale:

SWDs often experience working memory overload. Spaced retrieval practice anchors key academic vocabulary in long-term memory, reducing cognitive fatigue. Incorporating precise lesson hinge points prevents these scholars from getting left behind during fast-paced lessons, ensuring scaffolds are added or removed based on real-time data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Co-Planned Scaffolding for Independent Grade-Level Text Interaction

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Bi-weekly lesson plan reviews and co-teaching walkthroughs

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

General education and ESE teachers will co-plan daily accommodations that support SWDs in working with complex, grade-level texts independently rather than lowering the text level. Leadership

will monitor execution during walkthroughs, evaluating whether accommodations are actively facilitating independent comprehension.

Action Step #2

Tiered Vocabulary Retrieval Supports

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly during small group instruction and bi-weekly data reviews.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will implement scaffolded retrieval routines (e.g., using graphic word-mats or retrieval logs) to ensure SWDs systematically practice recalling academic terms. The ESE coach will track bi-weekly formative assessment items tied directly to standard vocabulary to measure growth.

Area of Focus #8

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: This area of focus targets school-wide foundational literacy proficiency for primary scholars in Kindergarten, First, and Second Grade. By shifting instruction toward systematic, phonics-based decoding and explicit language metrics, we ensure that early learners achieve fluid reading competency before entering intermediate testing grades.

Rationale: Review of our 2025–26 cumulative end-of-year data reveals that only 52% of our K-2 scholars performed at a Level 3 or higher across progress monitoring metrics. Leaving nearly half of our primary student body below grade-level expectations indicates a clear systemic deficiency in early word recognition, structural phonics instruction, and fluid instructional tiering, which creates cascading learning deficits as scholars progress.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Prior Year Data (2025-26): 52% of scholars in grades K-2 performed at a Level 3 or higher.

State Specific Outcome: By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, 60% of all scholars in grades K-2 will perform at a Level 3 or higher on their end-of-year comprehensive reading progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Student progress will be continually evaluated through the collection of monthly Early Literacy Formative Assessment Checks (ELFAC) data and other benchmark tracking tools. School leadership will conduct weekly walkthroughs during reading blocks to audit implementation fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Boulanger

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Description of Intervention: Implementation of an explicit, multi-tiered Science of Reading instructional framework aligned with the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI). This features the systemic deployment of the UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Institute) foundations program for whole-group instruction, backed by targeted, small-group remediation using fluid Flamingo groups (structured, multi-sensory literacy interventions developed by the UF Lastinger Center). Grouping and pacing are driven dynamically by PELI diagnostic frameworks and monthly ELFAC progress tracking.

Rationale:

Rationale for Choosing Intervention: The Science of Reading model proves that children become proficient readers when word recognition and language comprehension are explicitly taught. UFLI ensures that every primary scholar receives high-quality, uncompromised whole-group phonics delivery. Utilizing ELFAC data alongside our PELI partnership resources to dynamically shift scholars into fluid Flamingo groups eliminates static tracking, allowing teachers to target specific decoding gaps in real time before they widen.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Whole-Group UFLI Program Execution with Fidelity

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

K-2 instructional staff will deliver the structured UFLI daily phonics lesson sequence with absolute fidelity during the whole-group ELA block. School leadership will monitor impact by utilizing standardized UFLI observation rubrics to track the pacing, visual drilling, and automatic blending routines of teachers, correlating walkthrough trends directly with monthly phonics checkpoints.

Action Step #2

Data-Driven ELFAC Analysis and Fluid Flamingo Interventions

Person Monitoring:

Boulanger

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will pull and analyze student ELFAC performance data monthly to assess mastery of specific phonemic elements. Based on these outcomes, scholars will be flexibly shuffled into target Flamingo intervention groups to address isolated instructional gaps identified via the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI) tracking structures. Leadership will monitor impact by reviewing the student rosters every two weeks to guarantee student movement between groups remains fluid and directly driven by rapid skill acquisition.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: This area of focus aims to decrease the school-wide chronic absenteeism rate by building proactive, transparent communication habits with families regarding cumulative student absences. Regular attendance is a critical prerequisite for academic mastery; when scholars miss consecutive days, they drop out of established instructional loops and lose essential exposure to tier-1 academic vocabulary and daily retrieval practice.

Rationale: Review of our 2025–26 end-of-year data shows a critical barrier to student achievement: 32% of our total scholar population missed greater than 10% of the school year (the threshold for chronic absenteeism). Missing this much school creates severe learning fragmentation. This rate indicates a clear breakdown in standard communication lines, meaning families are often unaware of how quickly sporadic absences accumulate into a severe loss of instructional time.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Prior Year Data (2025-26): 32% of scholars were chronically absent (missing more than 10% of the

school year).

Specific Outcome: By the conclusion of the 2026-27 school year, the percentage of scholars missing greater than 10% of the school year will be reduced to 20% or less of the total scholar population.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Attendance percentages will be extracted and audited weekly by site-based CST. Progress will be reported monthly to the PTA, School Advisory Council (SAC), grade level teachers and reviewed during quarterly data updates to evaluate macro-trends across grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Assistant Principal - Amy Santos

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Description of Intervention: Implementation of an adaptive Notification-Based "Attendance Nudge" Messaging System (aligned with the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and Attendance Works frameworks). The school will send automated, positive, yet urgent text messages and personalized letters to parents or guardians. The messages will include: 1. The student's exact name. 2. The precise, cumulative number of days the student has missed that school year. 3. A supportive message framing the academic impact of those missed days.

Rationale:

Rationale for Choosing Intervention: IES evaluation data demonstrates that implementing a personalized text-messaging strategy reduces chronic absenteeism by 12% to 18% on average. This intervention works because it replaces cold, punitive legal truancy warnings with proactive, data-driven "nudges." It targets a common blind spot by giving families a real-time count of cumulative absences, allowing them to adjust behaviors before a student crosses into severe chronic status.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Automated Data-Matched Attendance Nudge Delivery

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Amy Santos

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Our data specialist will configure the student information system to pull automatic, cumulative absence reports. Every Sunday, families of scholars trending toward or exceeding the 10% threshold will receive an automated text showing their child's specific missed-day totals alongside a positive educational tip. Same-day notifications will deploy when an absence occurs. The School Attendance Team will monitor the impact by tracking week-over-week attendance changes following the texts to confirm drop-offs in repeat unexcused absences.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

New Heights Elementary ensures transparent, multi-channel communication of our School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Schoolwide Program (SWP) to foster shared ownership across all stakeholder groups.

1. Dissemination Channels & Audiences

- Families & Parents: Distributed via the jargon-free SIP One-Pager Flyer in first-week student folders, posted on the school's website, and presented during the Annual Title I Meeting, monthly SAC meetings, and Hawk Tawk family forums.
- School Staff & Leadership: Unpacked during pre-school planning, posted on the internal staff portal, and reviewed during bi-weekly PLCs and monthly leadership data chats.
- Scholars: Shared through student data-tracking folders, goal-setting conferences, and morning announcements.
- Community & Business Partners: Published on the school website's Title I tab and presented at quarterly SAC community briefings.

2. Language Accessibility & Compliance

Plain Language Format: Public summaries replace complex educational jargon with plain, accessible terminology so all stakeholders easily understand our targets.

- Multi-Language Translation: Key documents (including the SIP One-Pager and SWP summaries) are translated into primary non-English home languages (e.g., Spanish and Vietnamese).
- On-Site Translation Support: Bilingual staff and district interpreters are provided at all Title I, SAC, and family meetings to support non-English speaking families.
- Public Access: Printed, full-length copies of the complete SIP and SWP permanently available

in the main office and Parent Resource Room upon request.

<https://newheights-es.pcsb.org/>

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

At New Heights Elementary School, authentic family and community partnerships are essential to fulfilling our mission and driving student success. Grounded in our *Ubuntu* philosophy ("*I am because we are*"), we foster active, trust-based relationships through three core focus areas:

- Two-Way Communication & Progress Tracking: Families receive continuous updates via FOCUS complemented by parent-teacher data conferences following progress monitoring benchmarks (PM1, PM2, PM3). We also host monthly Hawk Tawk forums for open-door feedback and send supportive, data-informed text alerts to encourage daily attendance.
- Family Academic Capacity: We host interactive literacy and math nights aligned with the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI) and the Science of Learning, equipping families with practical strategies (phoneme-grapheme mapping, number bonds) to support learning at home.
- Shared Decision-Making & Community Support: Parents, business partners, and civic leaders collaborate through our School Advisory Council (SAC) to guide Title I decision-making and monitor budget allocations, while local partnerships provide student mentorship and campus resources.

Public Availability of the Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP)

In compliance with federal Title I regulations (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)), the New Heights Elementary PFEP is reviewed annually and accessible online:

- School Webpage: <https://newheights-es.pcsb.org/about-us/school-improvement-plan>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

To strengthen our core academic program and maximize the amount and quality of learning time, New Heights Elementary School is pivoting toward a high-density instructional model grounded in the Science of Learning. This approach directly integrates the core priorities detailed in Part II of our

School Improvement Plan:

- **Increasing Learning Time and Quality via Cognitive Efficiency:** Rather than simply extending school hours, we are fundamentally maximizing inside-the-classroom learning time. By training teachers on explicit lesson hinge points (*Areas of Focus 1, 2, 5, 6, & 7*), we eliminate dead instructional time. Teachers can instantly gauge classroom understanding and seamlessly transition from direct instruction to application, preventing the pacing drags that stall student progress.
- **An Enriched and Accelerated Curriculum for Expert Learners:** To reverse the downward trend in our intermediate learning gains, we are introducing a clear instructional distinction between novice and expert learners. Once a scholar demonstrates mastery at a lesson's hinge point, they are immediately accelerated into high-order, independent tasks, rather than being held back by repetitive remediation. This strategy ensures that historically proficient scholars—including our African American subgroup (*Area of Focus 6*)—are consistently pushed to interact with advanced, grade-level text analysis and non-routine mathematical problem-solving.
- **Strengthening Foundations via Evidence-Based Strategies:** We are infusing daily, low-stakes Retrieval Practice loops across all grade levels to anchor core concepts and tier-3 academic vocabulary (*Area of Focus 5*) into long-term memory. In primary literacy, Title I resources support explicit Phoneme-Grapheme Mapping and independent decodable text routines (*Areas of Focus 3 & 4*), providing early learners with the structural decoding stamina required to transition smoothly into independent reading levels.

By systematically reducing cognitive load, maximizing active tracking, and ensuring every subgroup has daily exposure to grade-level rigor, this Title I framework transforms our school day into a highly efficient engine for academic recovery and acceleration.

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

ESOL: New Heights Elementary School will ensure the unique needs of ESOL students are being met by the following strategies:

1. Ensuring high-quality, standards-based and culturally responsive educational programs for ESOL students and families.
2. Provide professional development for all educators working with ESOL students.
3. Providing information to families in their native language to the extent possible.

IDEA (ESE): New Heights Elementary School will conduct meetings with parents and our ESE team to discuss policies and procedures for ESE students, as well as, the specific learning needs and expectations for ESE students.

Title II (Professional Learning dept.)- New Heights Elementary School will take advantage of any support provided by the district in regards professional learning.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

NA

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

NA

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) helps schools effectively use their resources to provide high-quality instruction and interventions tailored to student needs. It addresses both academic and behavioral challenges through targeted support. The problem-solving/response to intervention (PS/RtI) part of MTSS is a key requirement under both the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004).

Benefits of an Effective MTSS In a well-implemented MTSS model, you'll see:

- Accelerated learning that closes existing gaps and prevents new ones.
 - Fewer students at risk over time.
 - Quick decisions about who needs extra support.
 - High success rates for interventions.
- Pinellas
NEW HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2025-26 SIP Printed: 06/25/2026 Page 40 of 44
- Clear goals focused on improving student achievement.

Key Roles in MTSS Implementation

- MTSS Coach: This school-based coach supports the framework by guiding staff. They help practice problem-solving skills, provide feedback, and develop coaching activities based on professional development, how well the plan is implemented, and student results.
- Title I Support Assistant: This role helps organize and implement academic and behavior support programs like PBIS and MTSS. They assist teachers with data analysis, documentation for problem-solving, and involving students, parents, and families in the MTSS process. They also participate in monthly training to stay current on enrichment, intervention, and prevention techniques.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Professional Learning for instructional staff will consist of weekly PLCs and Staff Meetings focused on schoolwide data that includes both scholar performance on state assessments, district assessments and trend data from daily administrative observations. Teachers will be provided with tailored support from instructional coaches for planning.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Title I funds continue to support the full day three-year old program at New Heights Elementary allowing the district to provide continuity of service for a full two years in early childhood prior to entering kindergarten. This seamless, two-year programming provides a strong foundation for school readiness and future educational success. This leads to a smooth transition between preschool and kindergarten for both scholars and parents. Families are familiar with the personnel, environment, rules, and safety procedures

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00