

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Heritage Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

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>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">55%</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;">68%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Booth, Mary	Principal	School Principal, Instructional Leader
Gluth, Angela	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Elementary Instruction
Banks, Autumn	SAC Member	SAC Chair, 4th grade Teacher
Laskey, Dana	Staffing Specialist	ESE Specialist
Korte, Laura	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Resource Teacher

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

497

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	74	65	74	68	80	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	10	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	4	6	2	0	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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

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	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				64%	52%	57%	60%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	37%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	54%	63%	61%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	57%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	46%	51%	26%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	50%	53%	43%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	64%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		39%	54%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged		44%	49%	70%
	Students With Disabilities		0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners		18%	40%	67%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		31%	49%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged		29%	46%	65%
	Students With Disabilities		0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners		18%	0%	21%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64%	79%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	62%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	43%	71%
	English Language Learners	52%	86%	86%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36%	59%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	40%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	80%	60%
	English Language Learners	7%	67%	80%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71%	80%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	78%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	65%	75%	75%
	English Language Learners	36%	36%	36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30%	48%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	36%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	50%	62%
	English Language Learners	0%	10%	20%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75%	86%	92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68%	76%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	70%	75%	86%
	English Language Learners	29%	57%	43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46%	65%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	39%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	56%	84%	96%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	60%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73%	81%	92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	70%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	58%	71%	60%
	English Language Learners	94%	81%	97%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44%	70%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	39%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	51%	64%	73%
	English Language Learners	19%	94%	97%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	76%	36%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%		
	Students With Disabilities	59%		
	English Language Learners	67%		

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	35	50	46	31	33	27	11				
ELL	53	50		58	60		45				
ASN	80			84							
BLK	66	55		56	55		50				
HSP	56	45		52	30		40				
MUL	62			57							
WHT	69	55		71	73		57				
FRL	56	51	46	53	43	17	38				
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				
FRL	47	49	35	48	41	22	26				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Reading and Math proficiency have increased each year since 2018. ELA bottom quartile gains have also increased since 2018. Overall math gains have also increased each year since 2018. However, when looking at both ELA and Math gains, the percentages are in the 50-58 percent range. All students can make learning gains, therefore improvement is needed in this area. The same is true for bottom quartile learning gains. We need to ensure that more students are making measurable learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

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%. For the 2020 school year, bottom quartile math gains were 29%, bottom quartile reading was 47%, and overall math gains were 58%, so we did see a slight increase in all three areas.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors may have included limited understanding in the depth of knowledge and content complexity and limited team planning. This year, we will implement weekly common planning time with the TTD and/or administrators to assist teachers in using current data to plan for core instruction as well as differentiation and acceleration in both reading and math. Teachers are also encouraged to attend the district's monthly math PLCs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

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.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The instructional model changed to where a highly effective teacher was teaching all four science blocks

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

During weekly planning sessions, use current data to plan for acceleration, having a designated area/time that is reflected in lesson plans and schedules for small group instruction, and during planning sessions, focus on grade level standards at the appropriate level of depth.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

PD opportunities will include objective and success criteria training and implementation, teacher clarity through balance of teacher and student talk and procedures to ensure students understand the learning targets success criteria, and how to effectively hold monthly data chats and data analysis.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

TTD and administration are conducting PD and Learning Walks to build capacity. Creating systems for planning, data analysis, and student and teacher goal setting that will continue in future years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Students at Heritage have a wide range of learning needs. Student achievement will increase through a systematic approach to effectively engage in core instruction, differentiation and acceleration 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 2020-2021 school year. It will be essential for teachers to work together to plan and implement strategies that will meet the needs of individual learner

Measurable Outcome:

In the 19-20 school year, 58% of students made learning gains in reading and in the 20-21 school year, 54% of students made learning gains in Reading on the FSA Assessment. Our 21-22 goal is for 100% of students to make learning gains on Reading FSA.
 In the 19-20 school year, 50% of students made learning gains and in the 20-21 school year, 58% of students made learning gains in Math on the FSA Assessment. Our 21-22 goal is for 100% of students to make learning gains on Math FSA.
 Our SWD had a proficiency rate of 34% on FSA for the 2019-2020 school year. Our 2021-2022 goal is for 50% of the SWD students to score proficiently on the Reading FSA.

Monitoring:

Teachers will receive monthly feedback focused on how acceleration and differentiation impacted student learning outcomes. Weekly planning with the TTD and administration will occur. Plans will include acceleration and differentiation strategies as well as common assessments for progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Weekly common planning with TTD
2. On-going coaching cycles and feedback by administration and coaches
3. On-going progress monitoring and data analysis sessions
4. On-going professional development in differentiation and acceleration

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 in the 2020-2021 school year. We will use iReady and support materials, Wonders support materials and SIPPS (K-2). Common assessments will be used to assess student needs and identify unfinished learning. Lessons will be differentiated to reinforce and enrich learning, prepare students for upcoming learning, and remediate as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

- TTD will facilitate weekly standards based planning sessions
- support development of instructional plans
 - evaluate student work and data
 - deepen teachers' understanding of resources and best practices
 - deepen teachers' understanding on concepts and content

Person Responsible

Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

- Students' data will be used in planning sessions and in separate data analysis sessions
- administer monthly assessments for students in math and reading
 - create action plans that address student data
 - adjust instructional plans regularly
 - leverage resources and staff to support student needs

Person Responsible Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

TTD and administrators will provide formative feedback instructional and student performance

- instructional learning walks
- formative classroom observations
- coaching cycles
- planning session support and protocol development

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities are scoring at 34% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Our SWD had a proficiency rate of 34% on FSA for the 2019-2020 school year. Our 2021-2022 goal is for 50% of the SWD students to score proficiently on the Reading FSA.

Monitoring: Monitored using data walls at monthly grade level data chats. Interventions are monitored weekly through Brainspring assessment and Rewards curriculum assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent and daily use of Brainspring and Reward curriculums along with frequent progress monitoring.

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 in the 2020-2021 school year. We will use iReady and support materials, Wonders support materials and SIPPS (K-2). Common assessments will be used to assess student needs and identify unfinished learning. Lessons will be differentiated to reinforce and enrich learning, prepare students for upcoming learning, and remediate as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Students' data will be used in planning sessions and in separate data analysis sessions

- administer monthly assessments for students in math and reading
- create action plans that address student data
- adjust instructional plans regularly
- leverage resources and staff to support student needs

Person Responsible Angela Gluth (angela.gluth@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Heritage reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools state wide, Heritage falls in the moderate category. One area of concern that we will monitor this year is the number of violent incidents. A review of the school incidents will be conducted to ensure that the incidents are being reported correctly. A review of the school incidents will be conducted to ensure that the incidents are being reported correctly. We will use discipline data such as referrals and we will monitor student and school culture through the Panorama Survey This year our school is implementing the 7 Mindsets core SEL program. This work will further support the positive school culture here at Heritage.

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.

Our school has adopted the 7 Mindsets core SEL curriculum to build upon the positive school culture that already exists. Students are learning how their mindsets impact their learning and their feelings. The core mindsets are Everything is Possible, Passion First, Attitude of Gratitude, We are Connected, 100% Accountable, Live to Give, and The Time is Now. These mindsets are explicitly taught in school and shared with our families and community stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Mary Booth, Principal and Angela Gluth, Assistant Principal- Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.

Andrea Simpson, School Counselor- Conducting class lessons and small group lessons to build a deeper understanding of the mindsets. Promoting, leading and supporting students, teachers, and families in the implementation of the 7 mindsets.

All Teachers- Implement weekly mindset lessons and promote a positive school and classroom climate and culture.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00