

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Heritage Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Heritage Elementary School

18201 E MEADOWS RD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Booth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Hillsborough 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Heritage Elementary School

18201 E MEADOWS RD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">57%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">67%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Heritage Elementary School will help each student reach their individual talents and goals every day through high expectations, teamwork and respect, and the celebration of our diversity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Heritage Elementary School will prepare our students for life!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Booth, Mary	Principal	Coordinate and oversee the decision making process to ensure integrity and consistency of the PS/Rtl implementation at the building level. The principal should attend PSLT meetings at the Tier 1 level, provide specific procedures for resource allocation, and monitor the fidelity of instruction/intervention at the school-wide and classroom levels (Tier 1)
Alvarez, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Coordinate and oversee the decision making process to ensure integrity and consistency of the PS/Rtl implementation at the building level. The assistant principal should attend PSLT meetings at the Tier 1 level, provide specific procedures for resource allocation, and monitor the fidelity of instruction/intervention at the school-wide and classroom levels (Tier 1)
Biella, Christina	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair- Supports the principal and staff in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the school improvement plan. Analyze and assess all school data that affects school achievement in order to plan and carry out activities that support the SIP's goals.
Andrews, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Ensures that when new content curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials, check fidelity of use of curricular materials and strategies, determine what elements need to be included in an effective core instructional program and assist the team in identifying which instructional strategies are most effective to address areas of concerns. The Content Specialist may also assist with monitoring the fidelity of instruction and intervention implementation across each tier.
Chambers, Maureen	School Counselor	Prior to the meeting, assists team members with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data on school wide behavior.
Stephens, Patricia	Psychologist	Prior to the meeting, assists team members with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data.
Laskey, Dana	Teacher, ESE	Prior to the meeting, assists with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data on our ESE students.
Korte, Laura	Other	Prior to the meeting, assists with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data on our ELL (English Language Learners) students.
Huffman, Alexa	Teacher, K-12	Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices. Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Redman, Evilee	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Schroeder, Laurie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Cavanaugh, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Middleton, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Brockman, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>
Culmo, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	<p>Communicate with and supports the PLC's in facilitating planning and implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Report on their efforts and student outcomes to the PSLT.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Mary Booth

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	64	67	66	87	85	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	6	6	6	6	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	64	81	99	86	83	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	4	6	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	64	81	99	86	83	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	4	6	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	64%	52%	57%	65%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	57%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	44%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	54%	63%	61%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	57%	62%	51%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	46%	51%	41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	50%	53%	52%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
	2018	69%	53%	16%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	55%	17%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	57%	9%	64%	2%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	53%	11%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	33	42	18	28	32	13				
ELL	63	61		63	48		64				
ASN	77	47		82	60						
BLK	57	53	38	58	45	25	54				
HSP	49	52	53	47	50	22	56				
MUL	77	50		64	35						
WHT	74	73		70	57	40	67				
FRL	50	54	49	52	47	20	50				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	47	42	31	45	29	17				
ELL	61	56	45	62	38	29	17				
ASN	78	70		75	55		57				
BLK	45	38	28	54	40	20	32				
HSP	57	59	44	52	46	29	48				
MUL	62	54		56	33						
WHT	71	49	40	72	52	30	44				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	47	49	35	48	41	22	26				
2017 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	26	35	36	40	42	44	9				
ELL	43	38	29	41	41	46					
ASN	78	75		89	92						
BLK	48	43	35	52	45	43	42				
HSP	69	65	45	58	50	36	65				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	74	63	50	66	49	43	48				
FRL	55	55	50	52	49	43	48				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	47
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.

In 2019, the lowest performing area was our bottom quartile math gains at 24%, followed by bottom quartile reading at 42%, and overall math learning gains at 50%. Contributing factors may have included limited understanding in the depth of knowledge and content complexity and limited team planning.

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

Unfortunately, bottom quartile math gains have been a reoccurring problem. The percentage score dropped 2 points from 2018 (26%) to 2019 (24%). I believe that factors contributing to this decline were limited team planning as listed above and inconsistencies in the common progress monitoring system to track student progress both in the bottom quartile, at the core level, and in tier 2 and 3.

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.

Again, the math bottom quartile group had a 27 point gap between our school at the state average.

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

The most improvement was in the area of science. Science achievement rose 20 points from 2018 to 2019 bringing our scores 10 points above the state average.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One concern for the 2020-2021 school year, based on the EWS, will be attendance. We have some students who have attendance issues and with Covid-19 this will continue to be an issue for all students. Our data also shows that we have an issue making learning gains with every student. We will have to closely progress monitor all students in order to identify learning gaps and interventions.

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

1. Learning gains for students in the bottom quartile in math
2. Learning gains for students in the bottom quartile in reading
3. SWD proficiency and learning gains
4. Learning gains for all students
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student achievement will be increased through a systematic approach to differentiated instruction in the classroom. It will be essential for our students to have access to the grade level core standards. The data suggests significant learning gaps among SWD and students in our BQ. We also know that there will be students who have significant learning deficits from eLearning in the fourth quarter. It will be essential for teachers to work together to plan and implement strategies that will meet the needs of individual learners.

Measurable Outcome: Weekly planning with the reading coach and administration (for a math focus) will occur. Data will be kept so that we can monitor planning of differentiation strategies and progress monitoring. At least 3 out of the 4 monthly grade level planning sessions will include planning focused on the plan, do, check, act cycle and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Andrews (melissa.andrews@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our data suggests significant learning gaps among SWD and students in our BQ. We also know that there will be students who have significant learning deficits from eLearning in the fourth quarter. We will use iReady and LAFS support materials, SIPS (K-2), and Achieve 3000 (grades 3-5).

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly planning sessions to include a focus on differentiation strategies

Person Responsible Melissa Andrews (melissa.andrews@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Monthly academic action teams to monitor and implement school wide progress towards achievement.

Person Responsible Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Monthly data dive with faculty highlighting math and reading data and gains.

Person Responsible Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Monitor the fidelity of differentiation practices in the classroom and create opportunities for learning walks focusing on differentiation in the classroom.

Person Responsible Christopher Alvarez (christopher.alvarez@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Weekly collaborative planning is the tool needed to plan for rigorous core instruction, plan for differentiation strategies, and conduct ongoing data discussions. Frequent progress monitoring of the core and tiered support groups is necessary to monitor progress and adjust instructional practices.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is for 100% of our students to make learning gains as measured through iReady (or FSA data if available).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school plans to use grade level student data sheets to frequently progress monitor core and tiered assessments. We will use iReady as the common assessment for all grade levels in reading and math. We will monitor student data and look for positive growth trends.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We will not be able to identify learning gains, data trends, or areas of need if we are not carefully and consistently monitoring data. Our daily plans and action steps will be guided in response to student data.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning sessions will include the use of data in at least 2 out of the 4 sessions. The plan, do, check, act model will be implemented and a member of the administrative team will attend each session.

Person Responsible Christopher Alvarez (christopher.alvarez@hcps.net)

Monthly supports for PLC facilitators will be embedded into the ILT to support collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Frequent Progress Monitoring- Weekly iReady data will be provided to teachers highlighting the usage and progress of students in the bottom quartile and SWD. Quarterly data chats with our VE teachers will help to monitor long term learning trends.

Person Responsible Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

na

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Heritage Elementary implements Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports to create a motivating and welcoming environment for our students. We have an active PTA, SAC, All-Pro Dads, and Garden club that support community involvement and family engagement. Opportunities for families to interact in school activities are provided through family academic nights, enrichment programs and presentations, as well as Zoom online parent trainings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.