

Sarasota County Schools

Heron Creek Middle School



2019-20 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Heron Creek Middle School

6501 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek

Demographics

Principal: Kristine Lawrence

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (61%)
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 Sarasota 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Heron Creek Middle School

6501 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

Heron Creek Middle School is a learning environment where all students will be provided readiness for options for college and/or careers, and life-long success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Heron Creek Middle School will provide educational excellence in a caring community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lawrence, Kristine	Principal	Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based decision-making, ensures that the MTSS Team implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Develops master schedule and interventions within the schedule.
Steiner, Jim	Instructional Coach	Assists with the screening and early intervention programs for at-risk students in reading; assists with progress monitoring and data collection, works with administration on master scheduling. Helps support student achievement through academic assistance/homework help.
Purcell, Kevin	Teacher, ESE	As Behavior Specialist, he works with student support services personnel and provides services and expertise on issues ranging from intervention with groups of students to individual students. Assists with PBIS initiatives and provides assistance with behavioral data and progress monitoring. Helps support student achievement through academic assistance/homework help.
Ryan, Heather	School Counselor	Supports the team regarding interventions, works with the school social worker and school psychologist to link children and families to community resources and outside agencies, supports family and home/school communication, addresses academic, social, and emotional needs of all students and provides overall student support.
Waterhouse, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Participates in data collection, assists and collaborates with ESE teachers, maintains accuracy of SWD goals and compliance.
Williams, Shenie	School Counselor	Supports the team regarding interventions, works with the school social worker and school psychologist to link children and families to community resources and outside agencies, supports family and home/school communication, addresses academic, social, and emotional needs of all students and provides overall student support.
Cimillo, Paula	Assistant Principal	Assists with the screening and early intervention programs for at-risk students in reading; responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions within the classroom.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shurley, Brittany	Assistant Principal	Leads student support services personnel on issues ranging from intervention with groups of students to individual students. Leads PBIS initiatives and monitors behavioral data of student discipline and attendance. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions within the classroom.
McKnight, Tracy	Paraprofessional	Provides targeted assistance to students and teachers in the implementation College and Career Readiness standards. Helps support student achievement through academic assistance/homework help. Assists with the screening and early intervention programs for at-risk students in reading.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	288	318	0	0	0	0	897	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	0	0	0	0	19	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	49	65	0	0	0	0	147	

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	32	43	56	0	0	0	0	131	

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

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

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	89	88	0	0	0	0	235	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	58	34	0	0	0	0	127	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	74	69	0	0	0	0	206	
	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	0	0	0	34	51	38	0	0	0	0	123	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	89	88	0	0	0	0	235	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	58	34	0	0	0	0	127	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	74	69	0	0	0	0	206	
	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	0	0	0	34	51	38	0	0	0	0	123	

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	58%	64%	54%	58%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	58%	54%	60%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	47%	50%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	66%	74%	58%	69%	71%	56%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	57%	66%	57%	72%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	56%	51%	61%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	61%	51%	53%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	85%	72%	0%	91%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	291 (0)	288 (0)	318 (0)	897 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (58)	5 (89)	11 (88)	19 (235)
One or more suspensions	1 (35)	1 (58)	0 (34)	2 (127)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	33 (63)	49 (74)	65 (69)	147 (206)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	64%	-9%	52%	3%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	54%	66%	-12%	56%	-2%
	2018	60%	70%	-10%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	50%	67%	-17%	55%	-5%
	2018	60%	66%	-6%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	73%	-5%	54%	14%
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	50%	65%	-15%	46%	4%
	2018	40%	63%	-23%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	54%	62%	-8%	48%	6%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	50%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	85%	-9%	71%	5%
2018	73%	80%	-7%	71%	2%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	73%	20%	61%	32%
2018	95%	77%	18%	62%	33%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	57%	-57%
2018	100%	71%	29%	56%	44%
Compare		-100%			

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	22	39	36	33	52	51	23	41	23		
ELL	22	51	54	46	67	58	30	40			
ASN	79	79		93	71						
BLK	46	50	46	54	47	33	32	67	50		
HSP	57	52	45	65	57	53	58	73	61		
MUL	54	51	53	61	53	42	47	69	62		
WHT	60	57	42	69	59	51	59	80	79		
FRL	54	52	42	62	55	46	53	74	63		
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	26	50	51	37	52	45	30	44			
ELL	22	54	55	61	68	58	20	73			
ASN	60	55			80						
BLK	41	47	39	51	64	50	31	63	73		
HSP	52	50	49	71	68	56	43	73	70		
MUL	48	57	70	66	70		59	75	73		
WHT	59	53	50	69	63	52	55	76	65		
FRL	50	50	49	63	62	52	47	71	61		
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	14	43	43	33	62	62	9		27		
ELL	36	51	42	48	53	37	20				
ASN	67	67		71	81		54				
BLK	35	41	39	44	62	67	23		36		
HSP	58	64	63	68	70	61	56		46		
MUL	70	71	40	70	79	75	58				
WHT	61	61	49	73	73	58	57		54		
FRL	54	59	52	64	71	63	48		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	58
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	582
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	46
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	81
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	47
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	56

Hispanic Students	
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	55
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

6th grade math showed the lowest performance on the FSA. There were extenuating circumstances with the teacher situation and most students that were scheduled into those classes were either identified as a student with a disability and/or also in the lowest quartile.

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

6th and 7th grade math. Between teacher circumstances and moving more students into advanced classes, students in 6th and 7th grade struggled with basic competencies and standards.

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.

Our ELA and Math lowest twenty-five percent showed the greatest gap between school and state averages. Many of the students in these sub-groups are identified as a student with a disability or an English Language Learner. There were new teachers in both areas.

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

8th grade math showed the most improvement. Both the general education and ESE teachers looped with their students helping to identify gaps in learning from the start.

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

The areas of concern continue to be the lowest twenty-five percent in both math and reading; specifically with students that are identified with a disability. Another area of focus is to increase the number of students scoring satisfactory with a 3 in achievement on both FSA math and reading,

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

1. Increasing learning gains of lowest twenty-five percent in reading
2. Increasing learning gains of lowest twenty-five percent in math
3. Increasing proficiency of achievement in our students with disabilities
4. Increasing proficiency of students in science achievement
5. Reduce number of student incidents/events through social emotional learning/PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Twenty-five percent in Reading
Rationale	44% of our students showed learning gains in reading. This is below the state and district average. This is an area that we have identified for the last 2 years with our leadership team and ELA department. Learning gains in reading of our lowest twenty-five percent is an area of weakness that we continue to work to improve. From the previous year, we have dropped in 6th grade (-3%) and 7th grade (-6%) for our lowest twenty-five percent. Our 8th grade students while decreasing on overall achievement, increased in learning gains among the lowest twenty-five percent by 3%. When looking at our subgroup of Students with Disabilities, we noticed that our 6th grade is down by 10%, our 7th grade is down by 27%, and our 8th grade is down by 17%; all below the state average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the 2021 school year, the percent proficient in the lowest twenty-five percent will increase from 44% to 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strategies to include: district provided professional development opportunities for teachers will be centered around strategies for striving readers, as well as instructional strategies based in disciplinary literacy. Master schedule supports ELA lowest 25% by placing ELL students in a double block ELA/Reading class with ELL teacher and SWD in a direct instruction class with an ESE teacher to best support their targeted needs. Students scoring a level 1 on the FSA ELA portion are scheduled in an ILA class. Students scoring a level 2 on the FSA ELA portion are placed with a reading endorsed teacher. We will monitor iReady data, including SWD student groups to determine any additional interventions specific to student. We will continue with Friday Night School each week for students needing additional help as well as establishing Work Lab Wednesday to support students during the school day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We saw increases in last year's data for our ELL population by how we strategically scheduled students into a double block of reading and ELA. We want to replicate that with our SWD in our direct instruction sections of ELA/Reading. Students will use the Rewards Reading Program to support grade 3 readers. We hope that by identifying and implementing reading and writing strategies within the ELA classroom, our lowest 25% will improve in their reading achievement. Teachers will use shared disciplinary resources to support students in their core classes.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enroll teachers in disciplinary literacy district professional development to encourage reading instruction across campus. 2. Utilize i-Ready data to progress monitor and identify students performing between the k-3 level on phonemic awareness; provide an opportunity for additional diagnostic, and place identified students into a Tier 3 reading multi-sensory, sequential, systematic, explicit instructional intervention program. 3. Continue targeted support by reading endorsed staff to Level 1 and Level 2 strategies; allowing opportunities for staff to communicate with peers about specific reading interventions.

4. Allocate additional support staff to Work Lab Wednesday offering small group intervention in addition to regular class time for reading based assignments.
5. Certified teachers will provide intervention support to select students during Friday night school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2	
Title	Lowest Twenty-five percent in Math
Rationale	57% of Heron Creek students made Math learning gains which is a -7% difference than the previous school year. This is 9% lower than the district average. This has been identified as an area of concern. This drop has continued to increase as we enroll additional students achieving Level 3 or higher into advanced level math courses as appropriate. 6th Grade lowest 25% saw an -18% decrease in students making learning gains. Similarly, 8th grade had a -10% decrease in students in the lowest quartile making learning gains. 7th grade only had a +2% increase in lowest quartile learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the 2021 school year, the percent proficient in the lowest twenty-five percent will increase from 57% to 61% of the lowest quartile students making learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strategies to include: Domain and Standards Tracking Document within each course content area, both with formative and summative assessments. Teachers will collaboratively plan standards based lessons, use i-Ready standards mastery to monitor and track student progress in order to implement supported lessons for students not making progress. 6th grade students working on basic fluency during 1st 10 minutes of each class using MobyMax for data collection.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In looking at our lowest 25%, students were not meeting the possible points within the FSA tested math domains. Using a tracking document and i-Ready Standards Mastery, will allow for teachers to progress monitor their students and determine the concepts in areas of weakness by standards within those tested domains. Teachers will use both formative and summative assessments for standards mastery. For 6th grade, increasing math fluency helps support our lowest 25% focus more on the problem solving process versus the computation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize i-Ready data, including formative and summative standards mastery to progress monitor and identify students performing below grade level in targeted math domains. 2. Use of IXL across grade levels for problem solving and fluency. 3. Continue targeted support by math staff to students needing additional support in math concepts. 4. Allocate additional support staff to Work Lab Wednesday offering small group intervention in addition to regular class time for math assignments. 5. Certified teachers will provide intervention support to select students during Friday night school. 6. Continue weekly collaboration during PLC in lesson planning and data driven instruction.
Person Responsible	Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	Learning Gains in Reading for SWD
Rationale	36% of identified students with disabilities made learning gains in reading at HCMS during the 18-19 school year. According to ESSA, we did not meet the state criteria for student learning gains for reading for SWDs in the 18-19 school year. 43% of 6th grade SWD students made a learning gain; a decrease of 8% from the prior year. 34% of 7th grade SWD students made a learning; a decrease of -14% from the prior year. 35% of 8th grade SWD students made a learning gain; a decrease of -17% from the prior year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the 2021 school year, the number of students with disabilities making learning gains will be 40%; moving closer to the goal of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strategies to include: Students scoring at the K-3 reading level on iReady will use the Rewards program with in their ESE classroom. Students with Disabilities have been scheduled strategically in an iReady advisory class period with an ESE teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order to close the achievement gap between students with disabilities, we will monitor SWD in their iReady progress, both in their lessons and standards mastery to identify areas of weakness for specific FSA tested domains. SWD are scheduled either in a Direct Instruction Language Arts and Reading class and/or an inclusion co-teaching class. Students reading at the third grade level will be provided specific interventions within their reading instruction on phonemic awareness, phonics and decoding.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enroll teachers in disciplinary literacy district professional development to encourage reading instruction across campus. 2. Utilize i-Ready data to progress monitor and identify students performing between the K-3 level on phonemic awareness; provide an opportunity for additional diagnostic, and place identified students into a Tier 3 Rewards reading multi-sensory, sequential, systematic, explicit instructional intervention program. 3. Continue targeted support by reading endorsed staff to Level 1 and Level 2 strategies; allowing opportunities for staff to communicate with peers about specific reading interventions. 4. Allocate additional support staff to "work-lab Wednesday" offering small group intervention in addition to regular class time for reading based assignments. 5. Certified teachers will provide intervention support to select students during Friday night school. 6. Continue working with ESE and General Education teachers on the co-teaching model of instruction for SWD.
Person Responsible	Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4	
Title	Overall proficiency in Science
Rationale	Our overall Science achievement for the 18-19 school year was 56%; which is a -%5 difference from the district average. However, we did increase our proficiency rate in a positive 5% increase from the previous year. Furthermore, the 23% of SWDs were proficient in science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the 2021 school year, the percent proficient in Science will increase from 56% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strategies to include: IXL for Science for spiral review of concepts, teachers collaborating on lesson planning and labs. Students in 8th grade Intensive Language Arts will receive instruction in science vocabulary and word parts (greek and latin derivatives).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Looking at the increase we made last year, we want to continue that positive upward trend using IXL for Science and data from the Benchmark Unit Assessments to help teachers collaboratively plan for supportive instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Benchmark/Unit assessment data to progress monitor and identify students areas of weakness. 2. Continue targeted support by Science staff and ILA teacher to students needing additional support with science concepts and vocabulary. 3. Allocate additional support staff to Work Lab Wednesday offering small group intervention in addition to regular class time for science assignments. 4. Certified teachers will provide intervention support to select students during Friday night school. 5. Continue weekly collaboration during PLC in lesson planning and data driven instruction. 6. Enroll teachers in disciplinary literacy district professional development to encourage reading instruction across campus.
Person Responsible	Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5	
Title	Social Emotional Learning/PBIS
Rationale	From 2018 to 2019 total discipline referrals were reduced by 17% from 760 to 629. From 2018 to 2019, our data indicates that we decreased the number of hours students spent in ISR by 49.5%; contributing to an increase of 654 hours spent in the classroom. We have decreased out of school suspension by 30%; with 265 days of total OSS in the 19-20 school year. Our school based referrals to mental health support totaled 32 referrals.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the 2021 school year, Heron Creek will decrease the number of student out of school suspensions by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brittany Shurley (brittany.shurley@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strategies include a continuation of the school-wide Positive Behavior Support System, which includes the Civility Squad initiative and implementation of the classroom management program "CHAMPS" from Safe and Civil schools, implementation of a school-wide safety team which meets bi-monthly to identify students in need of mental health support, and increase the level of support provided in School Wide Support Team and Children at Risk in Education to increase pro-active support to students; decreasing student discipline events and out of school suspensions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Overall, our data indicates a trend in the right direction with out of school suspension data. This approach will allow Heron Creek to continue to implement the programs that were working previously, but also increases our opportunities for pro-active success and early identification of students in need of supports prior to receiving discipline referrals or out of school suspensions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide professional development on classroom management strategies and PBIS system campus wide during pre-plan week and during once monthly PBIS meetings to increase level of support teachers directly provide to students for positive behavior. 2. All staff provided Kognito Mental Health Training pre-school week. 3. Create the safety team; identify the parameters that students will be brought to the team and evaluated. Assist in determining outside resources as well as internal resource for mental health and school-based counseling to support students with behavioral, mental, or emotional difficulties/struggles. 4. Create a continuous professional development model and team student for the SWST and CARE team to increase educator knowledge on how to identify and support students at risk; including ESE, 504, mental health, ELL, truant, and behavioral at-risk students. 5. Increase proactive supports like "Social Skills Lab" known as the PRIDE Room where students are scheduled to proactively meet with the behavior specialist to receive individualized attention and supports. 6. Provide five hours of student instructional related to social-emotional learning to promote overall health and wellness across campus to our staff and students.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

A healthy percentage of our students are making learning gains. Our staff culture is positive. Our staff and student relationships are on an upward trend. However, our students are not performing near the achievement of other students in the district and state. Our instruction lacks focus on clarity and building capacity for learning to move students beyond a years growth. While one of our main focuses is in regards to our SWD making 50% less gains than total school in ELA, we continue to monitor and increase our ELL population making +50% less gains than total school in ELA. A school-wide priority also continues to be overall achievement in ELA, which is -6% less than the district average and is on a downward trend.

Our school-wide focus will continue to remain on increasing vision and planning with high impact strategies in the forefront of decision making. We will monitor the use of high impact strategies during classroom visits and observations and provide collaborative and productive feedback to teachers to increase clarity in learning intentions. Our supports will be placed in assisting students through various methods of intervention to provide remediation and continued support to students moving between Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Our goal is to build a capacity for learning so that our students making more than one year's growth contributing to increasing our overall proficiency.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Twenty-five percent in Reading				\$4,533.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1261 - Heron Creek Middle School	General Fund		\$4,533.00
<i>Notes: Use of IXL to help support fluency of reading</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Twenty-five percent in Math				\$33,533.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1261 - Heron Creek Middle School	General Fund		\$4,533.00
<i>Notes: Use of IXL to help support computation fluency of math concepts.</i>						
		100-Salaries	1261 - Heron Creek Middle School	Other		\$29,000.00
<i>Notes: Extra Duty time contracts for before and after school to support students</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains in Reading for SWD				\$1,306.14
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	1261 - Heron Creek Middle School	General Fund		\$1,306.14
<i>Notes: Use of Rewards Reading Program to help support Lowest 25%</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Overall proficiency in Science				\$1,673.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1261 - Heron Creek Middle School	General Fund		\$1,673.00
			Notes: Use of IXL to help support spiral review of science concepts.			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning/PBIS				\$0.00
					Total:	\$41,045.14