

Sarasota County Schools

Heron Creek Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 9/30/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	61%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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. Provides CPI and Intervention training for all staff.
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
Idoyaga, Eric	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. Leads and monitors school health and safety policies and procedures.
Pizano, Carolina	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/30/2020, Kristine Lawrence

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.*

8

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%

2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	283	292	0	0	0	0	844
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	34	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	38	37	0	0	0	0	86
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	37	46	0	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	40	55	0	0	0	0	142

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	38	46	56	0	0	0	0	140	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/2/2020

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	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		

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	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		

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%
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				
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%	0

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%	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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Looking at our data, our Math overall showed declining results. 6th grade math in particular showed the lowest performance on the 2019 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.

The greatest decline would be in our 6th and 7th grade math data. 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 Lowest 25 percent in both ELA and Math showed the greatest gap between school and state averages. Many of the students in these groups are identified as a student with a disability or an English Language Learner. There was a new teacher in both areas as well as a larger percentage of students needing specialized instruction in reading and math due to their IEP.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was 8th grade math. Both the general education and ESE teachers looped with their students helping to identify gaps in learning from the start. Our math teachers began the work of progress monitoring standards during the school year.

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

The areas of potential concern for HCMS continues 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 making learning gains overall.

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 learning gains in reading with our students with disabilities
4. Increasing proficiency of students in science achievement
5. Continue postive trend of lowering student incidents/events through social emotional learning/
PBIS/CHAMPS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: One of our areas of focus is increasing our learning gains in reading with our lowest 25 percent student sub group. This is an area of weakness for HCMS, and one in which we continue to work to improve. In our most recent data, 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 several years with our leadership team and ELA department. From the previous year, we have dropped in 6th grade (-3%) and 7th grade (-6%) for our lowest twenty-five percent. In 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.

Measurable Outcome: By the 2021-2022 school year, the percent proficient school-wide 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: continued support and PLC opportunities to refine instructional strategies based in disciplinary literacy; including differentiation of materials and instruction for the striving reader. Our master schedule supports ELA lowest 25% by placing ELL students in a double block ELA/Reading class with the ELL teacher. SWD are scheduled within classrooms with both an ESE teacher and general education teacher to best support their needs. Students scoring a level 1 on the FSA ELA test are scheduled in an ILA class. Students scoring a level 2 on the FSA ELA portion are placed with a reading endorsed language arts teacher. We will monitor iReady instructional lessons and assesment data, including SWD student groups to determine any additional interventions specific to those students. We will continue with Friday Night School each week for students needing additional help as well as supporting students during the school day with Wednesday Work Lab.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We saw increases in previous 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 sections of ELA/Reading. We will use the Rewards Reading Program to support students at the K-3 grade reading level. 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 and reading scaffolds in their lessons to support students in their core classes.

Action Steps to Implement

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, intensive instructional intervention class (Rewards). Students K-2 that are identified ELL are utilizing the Just Words Reading Program in thier Reading class.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Continue intensive targeted support by reading endorsed staff for students reading below level (scoring Level 1 and Level 2 on FSA) while allowing opportunities for reading staff to communicate with content area peers about specific reading interventions.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Allocate additional support staff for Work Lab Wednesday and certified teachers for Friday Night School to offer intervention support for students struggling with reading based assignments.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Identify students for small group intervention instruction based on iReady lessons/reading based work which will be provided by school support staff/paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our second area of focus is our lowest 25% percent in Math. On our most current assessment data, 57% of Heron Creek students made math learning gains which is a -7% difference than the previous assessment data. This is 9% lower than the district average. This remains an area of concern for HCMS. 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.

Measurable Outcome: By the 2021-2022 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, with both 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 will also work on basic fluency during 1st 10 minutes of each class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Looking back 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, teachers will be able 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 identification of mastered standards. For 6th grade, increasing math fluency will help support our lowest 25% focus more on the problem solving process versus the computation.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize i-Ready data, including formative and summative standards mastery to progress monitor and identify students performing below grade level in targeted math domains.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. Use of IXL across grade levels for problem solving and fluency.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Continue weekly collaboration during PLC in lesson planning and data driven instruction.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Identify students needing targeted support in math concepts by math staff and/or support staff.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Allocate additional support staff for Work Lab Wednesday and certified teachers for Friday Night School to offer intervention support for students struggling with math concepts and assignments.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An area of focus for Heron Creek is to increase the learning gains in Reading for students with disabilities (SWD). 36% of identified students with disabilities made learning gains in reading at HCMS during the 18-19 school year, which was the last year assessed. According to ESSA, we did not meet the state criteria for student learning gains for reading for SWDs. 43% of 6th grade SWD made a learning gain; a decrease of 8% from the prior year. 34% of 7th grade SWD made a learning gain; a decrease of -14% from the prior year, and 35% of 8th grade SWD made a learning gain; a decrease of -17% from the prior year. In order to move from a Targeted and Intervention Supported School, we must make some gains for our students in this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome: By the 2021-2022 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 with disabilities scoring at the K-3 reading level on iReady will be scheduled into the Rewards reading program. A school-wide paraprofessional has been assigned to support reading classes, specifically to work with SWDs. Students with Disabilities have been scheduled strategically in an iReady advisory class period with an ESE teacher in order to monitor their daily/weekly instructional progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to better address the achievement gap with our students with disabilities, we will monitor SWDs in their iReady progress, both in their lessons passed and standards mastery progress to identify areas of weakness for specific FSA tested domains. SWDs scoring a Level 1 and Low Level 2 are scheduled into a Reading class and an inclusion co-teaching class with two teachers. Students reading at the third grade level will be provided specific interventions within their reading instruction on phonemic awareness, phonics and decoding.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize i-Ready data to progress monitor and identify students needing targeted support, including students performing between the K-3 level on phonemic awareness; providing an opportunity for additional assessment and placement into a Tier 3 Reading instructional intervention program (Rewards) and/or groups within the reading classrooms.

Person Responsible: Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Targeted support by reading endorsed staff to provide scaffolded lessons and specific strategies to students scoring a Level 1 and Level 2 on FSA; including opportunities for staff to communicate with peers about specific reading interventions (Strategic Instruction Model SIM) Strategies for students in this subgroup.

Person Responsible: Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Allocate additional support staff for Work Lab Wednesday and certified teachers for Friday Night School to offer intervention support for students struggling with reading based assignments.

Person Responsible: Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Work with ESE and General Education teachers on the coteaching model of instruction for SWD where beeded; support PLC study and implementation of High Expertise Teaching strategies.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the last Statewide Science Assessment, our overall achievement for the 18-19 school year was 56%; which is a -%5 difference from the district average. Although we did increase our proficiency rate with a positive 5% increase from the previous year, we hope to continue that postive trend in increasing the number of students scoring at a proficient level.

Measurable Outcome: By the 2021- 2022 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: Use of IXL for all Science courses for a spiral review of concepts. Use of Gizmos in all science classrooms for students, both face to face and remote to participate in lab simulations. Teachers at each grade level will collaborate 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). A Science Investigations course will be added to the master schedule in order to allow for students to participate in science standards in a fun and engaging way in addition to their core science class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reflecting on the increase we made on our last statewide assessment, we want to continue that positive upward trend by using IXL Spiral Review for Science and data from the Benchmark Unit Assessments to help teachers collaboratively plan for supportive instruction within their classes.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly PLC collaboration and discussion, utilizing Benchmark/Unit assessment data to progress monitor, identify students areas of weakness; support lesson planning and implement targeted strategies to support student learning of concepts and vocabulary.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Allocate additional support staff for Work Lab Wednesday and certified teachers for Friday Night School to offer intervention support for students struggling with Science concepts and assignments.

Person Responsible Kristine Lawrence (kristine.lawrence@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Continue to provide targeted support by Science staff and ILA teacher to students needing additional support with science concepts and vocabulary.

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Looking at our Early Warning Systems data of students having 2 or more indicators, our Students with Disabilities (SWD) make up a large percentage of that group, which makes up our Lowest 25%. Utilizing our support staff/leadership team, we will address student needs by aligning the appropriate support system for individual students within that group. Our PBIS program helps to proactively identify student's behavioral, attendance and social emotional needs, and also helps to support their academic progress by aligning their needs to targeted school-based supports (ie: PRIDE Room, behavior tech, SEL counselor, guidance, SWST, Social and Truancy Worker, Administration contacts for Remote learners)

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

At HCMS students and staff display PRIDE by demonstrating civility throughout the campus. The School also incorporates the use of the CHAMPS system of behavioral expectations along with our District's Civility Squad Character Traits as part of the Positive Behavior Support Plan that assists to increase in academic performance while clearly communicating behavioral expectations and establishing a positive school culture. The PBS plan also includes supports that addresses individual student needs through the use of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and RTI process which develops targeted intervention that best support student needs both academically and/or behaviorally. Both the CHAMPS and the MTSS-RTI programs are researched and evidence-based strategies.

The school's PBS program is centered around displaying and demonstrating PRIDE which stands for being Prepared, Responsible, In Control, Determined to Succeed, and to Earn and Give Respect. These PRIDE expectations are also tied to the Civility Character Traits of Paying Attention, Listening, Speaking Kindly, Saying Thank You, Keeping Your Cool, Rediscovering Silence, Staying Positive, Making a Difference, Accepting Others, and Respecting Others which are promoted monthly to all school stakeholders. The CHAMPS program then provides an additional layer of specific behavioral expectations tied to an activity and/or area of the school such as the classroom, hallways, cafeteria, etc. Teachers and staff practice and teach these expectations and the school promotes and posts messaging that is consistent throughout the campus so students can quickly reference appropriate behavior expectations anytime during the school day and in all areas. This communicates to our students how they should behave and interact with other students and staff. All Teachers and staff members use the expectations and traits as the bases for rewarding students for exhibiting Pride behaviors. The school has also developed a PRIDE rubric for our remote learners that aligns and communicates positive behavior expectations for our remote students as well. The school also has a rewards system in place that provides for ongoing recognition of students exhibiting the PRIDE expectations where they are celebrated on a bi-monthly and quarterly basis.

The school also supports students on an individual level using the Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports – RTI process. The MTSS-RTI process and strategies assist to effectively address problem behaviors along with academic concerns using targeted interventions. Interventions and supports are developed using research-based strategies that are aligned to the student needs in collaboration with input from teachers, the SWST, and parents. If the concerns are academic, then the teacher works with colleges and district curriculum specialists to develop the most appropriate targeted intervention. For behavior concerns teachers work with our Behavior Specialist to develop interventions and strategies to best support the student needs. These behavioral interventions are then tied to our PBS plan whenever possible.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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