

Broward County Public Schools

Heron Heights Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Heron Heights Elementary School

11010 NOB HILL RD, Parkland, FL 33076

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer McGreevy

Start Date for this Principal: 11/8/2018

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	9%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Broward 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Heron Heights Elementary School

11010 NOB HILL RD, Parkland, FL 33076

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	9%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

The mission of Heron Heights Elementary is to provide an innovative teaching and learning environment that will empower the school community to excel in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is based on tenants laid out by the School Board of Broward County. The Heron Heights Elementary School Community believes that: All students will learn when their individual needs are met; Positive stakeholder involvement enhances student achievement; Learning is a lifelong process; Everyone must be held to the highest ethical standards to achieve excellence; Every student has a right to a high-quality educational option; Everyone must contribute to and be held accountable for student achievement; Engaged families combined with highly effective teachers and school leaders are the core components of a successful school; Students must be prepared as innovative thinkers and responsible citizens to compete in a global economy; An equitable education provides all necessary resources to meet student needs; and Positive character education is essential to whole child development.

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
Weiss-Schnur, Merideth	Principal	<p>The Principal shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent in accordance with rules and regulations of the School Board, for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of the school to which the individual is assigned. 2. Submit recommendations to the Superintendent regarding the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer, and dismissal of all personnel assigned to the school. 3. Assume administrative responsibility for all records and reports required regarding pupils, for the transfer of pupils within the school, and for the promotion of pupils. 4. Have the authority to discipline students up to and including the suspension of students from school or from a school bus as provided for in F.S.1003.32. 5. Enforce the Broward County Schools Code of Student Conduct.
Griffiths, Michelle	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor high quality educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Glancy, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor high quality educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Marino, Celia	Instructional Coach	<p>The Literacy Coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic literacy-focused mentoring, coaches will support teachers to develop skills in analyzing student work, differentiating instruction, supporting English Language learners and students with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.</p> <p>The goal of the Literacy Coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for literacy learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining literacy instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity for literacy across the curriculum.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Celestin, Shakira	School Counselor	<p>The Elementary Guidance Counselor shall establish small group counseling sessions; counsel students on personal and academic concerns and notify parents as deemed necessary; provide materials and suggestions for classroom oriented guidance activities; arrange student, parent and teacher conferences; acquaint students new to the school with teachers, facilities and programs to help them adjust to their new environment; assist in the early identification of students for proper educational placement, such as exceptional child, federal and bilingual programs; work with parent groups in the area of child growth, development and discipline; meet with teachers to present and explaining the results of various testing programs; assist teachers in effective utilization of test results; identify community and school system resources and when advisable, refer student situations to the proper agencies, keep records of conferences and send reports within the limits of confidentiality, to the principal, administrative assistants, and/or teachers as requested; and gather information from all faculty members having contact with a student being considered for referral.</p>
LaBranche, Lisa	Other	<p>The Exceptional Student Education Specialist shall carry out the performance responsibilities listed below. Serve as the principal's designee for all exceptional student education (ESE) staff in accordance with the annual Local Education Agency (LEA) Memo. Administration and the ESE Specialists are required to submit a signed agreement annually. Coordinate required ESE meetings. Provide information to school-based personnel on a variety of topics to include updating staff on policy changes. Assist regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP goals. Assist staffing committee members in developing appropriate IEPs and ensure parents receive draft IEPs for all annual reviews. Meet with ESE curriculum supervisors monthly with regard to curricula, related services and program delivery systems for students with disabilities. Provide explanations to parent(s) of the Procedural Safeguards as well as the availability of resources within the District to meet the unique needs of the student. Utilize facilitative behaviors consistent with the Facilitated IEP training provided by the District in order to conduct efficient and productive IEP meetings, in which all participants feel valued and heard. Assist in identifying, reporting and correcting IDEA compliance concerns identified internally. Shall report all compliance concerns directly to the school-based leadership. Correct compliance errors identified internally (within the school) and externally, in accordance with federal, state and local laws, rules, policies and procedures. Communicate effectively with parents, colleagues and other stakeholders to ensure that IEPs for students with disabilities are implemented with fidelity. Utilize the electronic management system to generate IEP documents.</p>

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	176	208	180	187	202	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1137
Attendance below 90 percent	6	6	9	9	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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)

59

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	59%	57%	79%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	69%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	63%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	65%	63%	80%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	66%	62%	75%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	53%	51%	57%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	46%	53%	67%	45%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	176 (0)	208 (0)	180 (0)	187 (0)	202 (0)	184 (0)	1137 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 ()	6 ()	9 ()	9 ()	7 ()	8 ()	45 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	16 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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
03	2019	85%	60%	25%	58%	27%
	2018	83%	59%	24%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	62%	27%	58%	31%
	2018	77%	58%	19%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	75%	59%	16%	56%	19%
	2018	80%	56%	24%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	65%	17%	62%	20%
	2018	86%	63%	23%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	67%	23%	64%	26%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	72%	64%	8%	60%	12%
	2018	78%	62%	16%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	49%	17%	53%	13%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	43	39	19	38	45	36	39				

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
ELL	71	58	53	73	70	43	57				
ASN	88	70		89	84		92				
BLK	80	70		65	60						
HSP	79	65	38	77	62	54	47				
MUL	83			78	80						
WHT	82	69	57	83	70	59	68				
FRL	68	51	44	70	60	44	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	52	58	47	52	57	32	50				
ELL	76	61	38	74	58	33	58				
ASN	91	88		93	88		81				
BLK	63	53		53	53		64				
HSP	74	54	25	78	53	33	68				
MUL	75	50		83	60						
WHT	82	69	59	85	67	48	75				
FRL	60	48	25	68	53	38	43				
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	33	39	29	45	57	41	15				
ELL	64	85	88	59	71	63	40				
ASN	90	69		96	72		85				
BLK	67	59		58	41						
HSP	73	71	70	72	69	41	68				
MUL	75	77		69	85						
WHT	80	69	64	83	79	69	69				
FRL	61	66	65	54	51	36	37				

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	68
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	61
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	85
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	69
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	61
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	70
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	55
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.

The SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance overall with a Federal Index of 37. Nineteen percent of SWD in the lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains. When examining possible factors contributing to this decline, we are evaluating the alignment of supplemental academic programs with individual student needs.

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

The greatest decline in performance was evident in the same subgroup as our lowest performance: the SWD subgroup. In 2018, SWD had a Federal Index of 50. In 2019, this subgroup had a Federal Index of 37. Each of the school grade components within this subgroup showed a decline in scores except for lowest quartile math learning gains.

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.

Each of the school grade components were above the state and district averages except for ELA lowest quartile learning gains. In ELA Lowest 25th percentile, Heron Heights scored 1 percentage point above the state and scored the same as the district with 54% of these students showing

learning gains. We are evaluating potential deficiencies in the professional development needs of our staff in the area of literacy as possible contributing factors for the gap.

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

The data component with the most improvement was in our lowest quartile math learning gains. In 2018, 45% of these students demonstrated gains. In 2019, that number increased to 57% of our students demonstrating gains. Our school has increased teacher content knowledge and use of hands-on manipulatives as strategies to support conceptual development in this content area.

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

The only potential area of concern is our attendance below 90 percent. Approximately 4% of our school population has attendance below 90 percent as of the second week of school. While not yet an area of concern, it is something we will continue to monitor.

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

1. Increase performance of SWD in all school grade components
2. Increase performance of ELA lowest 25th percentile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase performance of SWD in all school grade components
Rationale	The SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance overall with a Federal Index of 37. This is an area we will focus on improving.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In the 2019-2020 school year, the SWD subgroup will demonstrate a Federal Index above 50.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Merideth Weiss-Schnur (merideth.weiss-schnur@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	A Focused and Authentic Professional Learning Community
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Broward County Public Schools includes a focused and authentic PLC as part of the their blueprint for student success. It is also included as an evidence-based strategy within our District school improvement plan. This strategy will allow all teachers to engage in a systematic study of instructional strategies and collaborate on best practices for student success while working together to improve their teaching skills.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will form PLC teams at the beginning of the school year and develop their instructional goals aligned with the school's state and district school improvement plan goals 2. Administration will meet with PLC teams to monitor teacher implementation towards reaching plan goals and implementing PLC protocols 3. Teams will meet regularly to engage in the work of monitoring student progress and using data to drive their instructional decisions towards meeting plan goals 4. At the end of the year, PLC teams will collaborate with the leadership team to reflect on student outcomes and plan for improvements for the following year
Person Responsible	Merideth Weiss-Schnur (merideth.weiss-schnur@browardschools.com)

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).