Heritage Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Heritage Elementary School

18201 E MEADOWS RD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Booth
Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (75%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Heritage Elementary School

18201 E MEADOWS RD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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 guide students to meet individual goals through self accountability, a growth mindset and demonstration of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Heritage Elementary School will prepare our students for life through high expectations for academic and personal growth.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Booth, Mary	Principal	School Principal, Instructional Leader
Redman, Evilee	SAC Member	SAC Chair, 3rd grade teacher
Korte, Laura	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Resource Teacher
Laskey, Dana	Staffing Specialist	ESE Resource Teacher
Sturlaugson, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	TTD, 3rd grade teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/12/2022, Mary Booth

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

473

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	69	71	80	71	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	13	12	10	14	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	3	13	12	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	6	12	3	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	0	5	9	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	5	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 7/12/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	53%	56%				64%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	73%						58%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						42%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	50%	50%				61%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	89%						50%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	87%						24%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	59%	59%				63%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	36	72	68	45	78	82	39				
ELL	51	79	60	68	76		56				
ASN	79	94		90	94		73				
BLK	60	70	77	71	91	94	50				
HSP	62	72	55	63	77		71				
MUL	68	62		84	92						
WHT	70	68		78	93		70				
FRL	50	70	67	64	83	83	40				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
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	86
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	73
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	66
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	69
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	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 and Math bottom quartile gains increased this year. Overall math gains have also increased each year since 2018.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest needs for improvement are ELA proficiency at 67% and ELA bottom quartile gains at 64%.

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

Writing scores averaging in the mid-range 5s and 6s contributed to this need for improvement. Contributing factors may have included limited understanding in the depth of knowledge and content complexity.
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. This will allow a deep dive into new Wonders curriculum and district instructional guides. Teachers are also encouraged to attend the district's PD sessions and school based Professional Development sessions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The 2022 data showed the most improvement in Math Proficiency at 74% (which was a 11 point increase from 2021) Math Bottom Quartile at 87% which was a 58 point increase from 2021), and Math Gains at 89% which was a 31 point increase from 2021).

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

The contributing factors to this improvement are common planning time with the TTD, data analysis, target groups, district support during planning sessions, and teachers attending district math monthly PLCs,

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 student self assessment rubric implementation, PD to ensure phonics instruction is integrated into context, writing support in evidence and elaboration and organization across all grade levels, teacher clarity through balance of teacher and student talk and procedures to ensure students understand the learning targets success criteria, and strengthen the effectiveness of monthly PLCs

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. Continue the collaborative work through sharing student work, teacher expertise, and differentiation/MTSS instruction.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Student achievement will increase through a systematic approach of targeted instruction through weekly collaborative planning and structured professional learning communities. Schoolwide structures will focus on rigorous core instruction, differentiation, ongoing data analysis, and communication with stakeholders. While we made growth in Reading and Math proficiency between 2020-2021 school year and 2021-2022 school year, the data suggests this is still an area we can continue to improve. It will be essential for teachers to work together to plan and implement strategies that will meet the needs of each individual learner
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In the 20-21 school year, 66% of students were proficient in Reading and in the 21-22 school year, 67% of students were proficient in Reading, based on the FSA Assessment. In the 20-21 school year, 63% of students were proficient in Math and in the 21-22 school year, 75% of students were proficient in Math, based on the FSA Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will receive monthly feedback focused on how core instruction and differentiation impacted student learning outcomes. Weekly planning with the TTD and administration will occur. Plans will include differentiation and engagement strategies as well as common assessments for progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	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 new state standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	While we made growth in Reading and Math proficiency between 2020-2021 school year and 2021-2022 school year, the data suggests this is still an area we can continue to improve. 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.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

TTDs 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   Mary Booth (mary.booth@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

Mary Booth, Principal and Brandi Anderson, 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.