

Sarasota County Schools

# Heron Creek Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Heron Creek Middle School

6501 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek)

## Demographics

**Principal: Kristine Lawrence**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 77%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: B (59%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: B (58%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Heron Creek Middle School

6501 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/heroncreek)

## School Demographics

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School<br/>6-8</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>61%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>         | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>38%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | 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**

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Active                 |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)                           | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)                                    | K-12 General Education |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>   | No                     |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 77%                    |

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

| <b>ELA</b>            |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 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%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 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%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

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

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>CIVICS EOC</b>   |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 76%           | 85%             | -9%                          | 71%          | 5%                        |
| 2018                | 73%           | 80%             | -7%                          | 71%          | 2%                        |
| Compare             |               | 3%              |                              |              |                           |
| <b>HISTORY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 93%           | 73%             | 20%                          | 61%          | 32%                       |
| 2018                | 95%           | 77%             | 18%                          | 62%          | 33%                       |
| Compare             |               | -2%             |                              |              |                           |
| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 0%            | 69%             | -69%                         | 57%          | -57%                      |
| 2018                | 100%          | 71%             | 29%                          | 56%          | 44%                       |
| Compare             |               | -100%           |                              |              |                           |

### Subgroup Data

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| 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 particpate 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.