Heritage High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Heritage High School

2351 MALABAR RD NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

http://www.heritage.brevard.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Heritage High School creates a school culture promoting college and career readiness through advanced programs and instilling pride in students to use beyond high school years.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Heritage High School commits to educational excellence with the use of high-yield instructional strategies that prepare students for post-secondary achievement.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Link, Stephen	Principal	Principal Stephen Link is responsible for the development and implementation of school's mission and vision and for maintaining a positive and safe school culture/environment. In addition, Mr. Link is responsible for observing and evaluating teacher performance (specifically, math and new teachers) and creating a learning environment where all stakeholders thrive, and student achievement is a priority.
Tracy, Kavitha	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kavitha Tracy is the Assistant Principal of Curriculum at Heritage High School. Mrs. Tracy is responsible for ensuring that standard-based instruction is occurring in all core subject areas, observing and evaluating classroom teachers (specifically, ELA and intensive reading) and for creating a master schedule for teacher assignments. In addition, Mrs. Tracy oversees and manages the Student Services department, and creates a positive, safe, and collegial climate amongst teachers, staff, and students. Mrs. Tracy provides teacher support, implements the school's mission and vision, and creates a learning environment in which student achievement is a priority.
Browning, Chris	Assistant Principal	Mr. Chris Browning is the Assistant Principal of Facilities at Heritage High School. Mr. Browning is responsible for maintaining campus compliance with safety procedures and drills and supports and facilitates a climate of positivity, safety, and collegiality amongst teachers, staff, and students. In addition, Mr. Browning conducts formal observations and evaluations of classroom teachers (specifically social sciences), implements the school's mission and vision and promotes a safe and positive learning environment where student achievement is a priority.
Sabokrouh, Jemma	Assistant Principal	Ms. Jemma Sabokrouh is an Assistant Principal at Heritage High School. Ms. Sabokrouh is responsible for maintaining school safety by monitoring student behaviors throughout campus and by working directly with students in the dean's office. She formally observes and evaluates teacher performance (specifically science) and ensures that standard-based instruction is occurring with in the science department. In addition, Ms. Sabokrouh is the PBIS coordinator, supports teachers with student discipline, and creates a learning environment where student achievement is a priority.
Dotson, Danny	Assistant Principal	Dr. Danny Dotson is an Assistant Principal at Heritage High School. Dr. Dotson is responsible for maintaining school safety by monitoring student behaviors throughout campus and by working directly with students in the dean's office. He formally observes and evaluates teacher performance (specifically ESE), ensures that standard-based instruction is occurring with in the department and that IEP's and ESE meetings are in compliance with state statutes. He works closely with student services to ensure that learning needs are being met, supports teachers with student discipline, and creates a learning environment where student achievement is a priority.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Peters, Denise	Reading Coach	Mrs. Denise Peters is the Literacy Coach at Heritage. She provides professional learning and growth opportunities to the faculty, promotes a culture of school-wide literacy through modeling lessons across disciplines and encourages all teachers to implement literacy strategies into their content area. Mrs. Peters is the the Lead Mentor Teacher and she coordinates all new teacher meetings and initiatives, including the BPS Induction and Mentoring Program. In addition, she analyzes school-wide data and identifies trends, strengths and weakness and identifies at risk students. Mrs. Peters participates in the MTSS process and creates necessary interventions for ongoing progress monitoring, facilitates professional learning communities and department meetings and conducts peer and mentor observations with teacher feedback.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

At HHS the SIP involvement and development includes the school leadership team and teacher leaders. Heritage incorporates parent and student voice by discussing the SIP development at monthly SAC meetings and reviewing the Parent Survey and Youth Truth Survey to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement.
For example, areas of concern on the parent survey were the need for Increased parent/teacher communication, and the need for information and resources to help student learning at home. Teacher leaders from each core subject area will develop and launch additional resources that are available to students to assist their learning at home through Canvas and Google Classroom. These resources will be shared with the School Advisory Council and will be available through the school web-site, and FOCUS. Student data from our 2023 Youth Truth Survey, indicates that Heritage's two highest key ratings were College and Career Readiness and Culture. The lowest key ratings were in relationships (for 3 consecutive years), and academic challenge. The key ratings in the Youth Truth Survey that need improvement will be addressed with the reinforcement of standard aligned instruction, raising the rigor in daily instruction, and developing positive relationships with students.
The Teacher Insight Survey results are also used to account for the whole faculty, which drives important conversations surrounding the SIP and building a positive culture at Heritage.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP at HHS will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on student achievement as follows:

IMPLEMENTATION
Classroom walkthroughs and feedback sessions will occur with admin and teachers to appropriately monitor achievement levels and implementation strategies learned at PD.

IMPACT
Effective implementation will be reviewed through deep data dives following each progress monitoring test window. Our SIP team will meet post ELA PM and math PM windows to analyze data and to review the impact on increasing achievement of students in meeting the FLDOE academic standards, particularly our subgroups of concern, SWD and ELL. Following the winter test window, BEST assessment teacher and student data will be reviewed to ensure we are showing achievement gains across all core subjects.

REVISIONS
HHS will revise the SIP action steps as necessary while also incorporating professional learning opportunities to ensure our teachers and students are demonstrating continuous improvement across all core subjects with a clear focus on college and career acceleration and graduation rate. Finally, HHS admin will reflect upon annual survey data that is collected through Youth Truth (student), Insight (teacher), and Parent Surveys as another means of SIP monitoring.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	43	50	43	52	51	45		
ELA Learning Gains				49			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			30		
Math Achievement*	22	34	38	32	40	38	30		
Math Learning Gains				41			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			22		
Science Achievement*	58	59	64	59	37	40	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	63	66	60	44	48	62		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	85	87	89	92	63	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	69	72	65	58	66	67	67		
ELP Progress	56	57	45	34			39		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	85

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	4	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	51			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	45			
HSP	51			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			22			58	55		85	69	56
SWD	13			10			30	30		39	6	
ELL	31			14			47	27		55	7	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34			15			43	46		63	6	
HSP	37			21			54	45		69	7	49
MUL	37			21			68	55		63	6	
PAC												
WHT	47			30			70	66		75	6	
FRL	37			20			54	51		64	7	49

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	49	45	32	41	47	59	60		92	58	34
SWD	13	32	33	15	39	50	29	33		89	21	
ELL	31	56	57	22	29	40	47	39		88	39	34
AMI												
ASN	63	44					70	60		100	73	
BLK	29	43	43	21	42	51	46	48		95	56	20
HSP	45	51	47	36	43	48	56	63		90	53	32
MUL	49	53	60	24	31		49	67		96	57	
PAC												
WHT	49	52	43	40	42	48	70	68		88	63	
FRL	37	48	44	28	39	45	52	55		91	57	36

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	45	40	30	30	25	22	49	62		90	67	39
SWD	14	22	23	11	31	33	26	33		92	30	
ELL	16	28	29	18	23	21	27	40		92	74	39
AMI												
ASN	47	44		46	25		80					
BLK	33	35	29	20	22	29	39	52		92	57	
HSP	47	42	26	24	21	24	48	62		93	65	41
MUL	51	38		30	21	18	45	68		81	77	
PAC												
WHT	51	41	31	41	32	14	58	68		88	74	
FRL	39	37	29	23	21	23	43	54		89	66	41

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	44%	54%	-10%	50%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	48%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	51%	-28%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	50%	-26%	48%	-24%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	63%	-8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	63%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Algebra 1 proficiency, with 23% of students scoring a level 3 or above. Geometry proficiency was not far behind, with 24% of students showing proficiency. Contributing factors could be the lack of students taking and passing Algebra 1 in middle school, and the elimination of Algebra 1 B, which previously provided students who were not proficient in Algebra 1 an opportunity to practice their skills and receive more intensive and explicit instruction before re-taking or taking the B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC. In addition, our students with

disabilities have been below the Federal Index for 3 years in a row due to significant deficiencies in math and ELA proficiency.

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

Geometry is the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 17% decline from 32% proficiency in 2022 to 24% proficiency in 2023. The 3- year data trend represents a decline in geometry proficiency from 41% proficiency in 2021, 32% proficiency in 2022 and 24% proficiency in 2023. We are significantly below both the state and district student proficiency rates, with the state having a 3-year trend from 45% to 50 %, to 48% proficiency and the district showing a 3- year trend between 50 and 51 % proficiency. Factors that may have contributed to the decline in geometry proficiency as evidenced by the teachers is that students were not proficient in algebra skills; therefore, resulting in more time reviewing algebra skills rather than spending the time needed to master the geometry 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.

Algebra 1 is the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. 23% of the students at Heritage were proficient on the B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC, and students in the state of Florida showed 50% proficiency, leaving a 27% gap between Heritage and the state. The 3-year data trend has been somewhat inconsistent, with only 17% of the students being proficient on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2021 and increasing to 28% proficiency in 2022 and then a slight decline to 23% of the students being proficient in 2023. Factors that may have contributed to the decline in proficiency and the large gap between the state and Heritage are the new assessment, and the elimination of the Algebra 1 B course, which provided students who were not proficient in Algebra 1 an opportunity to practice their skills and receive more intensive and explicit instruction.

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

The 9th Grade ELA data component showed the most improvement with a 9% increase in proficiency, which was the greatest improvement amongst freshmen in the district. In addition, our overall ELA proficiency improved by 4%. New actions taken in this area include teachers offering additional student help sessions after and before school and during their lunch periods and the consistent implementation of Saturday School. Saturday School offered structured lessons in all core subject areas and teachers were given a paid incentive to commit to participating in all Saturday School sessions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Although the state is not requiring grades 9-12 to report on Early Warning Systems in the 2023/2024 School Improvement Plan, Heritage analyzed the EWS data and identified two areas of concern that support our plans data, areas of focus and action steps. The two EWS components/categories that require attention are the ELA Level 1 on State Assessment and Substantial Reading Deficiency. Our SIP is addressing both Early Warning Systems through the action steps under Instructional Practice Specifically relating to ELA and ESSA Subgroup Specifically relating to Students with Disabilities. The majority of SWD fall into both EWS categories. Heritage has re-organized the way of meeting these students needs by hiring 4 ESE Support Facilitators to push into ELA general education classrooms with high numbers of ESE students. This additional support helps to meet the individual needs of these students in small group and one on one settings, while specifically working on their IEP goals and implementing appropriate accommodations.

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

ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities
Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math (Algebra 1 & Geometry)
Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other (required for our school status)

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Heritage has been a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) since 2014 and the expectations are that Panthers are responsible, respectable, and prepared. Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2023-2024 school year, which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys," and the student survey, The Youth Truth Survey. These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.
• The Parent Survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school (92.05%) and information being sent from the principal (76.62%). Areas of improvement included: Increased in parent/teacher communication and information and resources to help student learning at home. In addition, parents would like to attend informational meetings regarding graduation and promotion requirements.
• Student data from our Youth Truth Survey, which was administered in 2023 indicates that Heritage's two highest key ratings were College and Career Readiness and Culture. According to the survey students feel equipped to pursue college and careers and believe that their school fosters a culture of respect and fairness. The lowest key ratings were in relationships (for 3 consecutive years), and academic challenge. Unfortunately, only 21% of the students who took the Youth Truth Survey feel they receive support and personal attention from their teachers and 45% feel that they are challenged by their coursework and teachers.
• Heritage's instructional staff participated in the EDI Insight Survey in 2023 and the Instructional Culture Index decreased slightly from 7.3 (2022) to 7.1 (2023). Key areas of success include evaluation, professional development and leadership. Key areas that require improvement are the hiring process and peer culture.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Heritage High School will increase the weekly percentage of teacher to parent communication by 35% as evidenced on the 2024 Parent Survey.

Heritage High School will increase the key rating of relationships by 40%. and the key rating of academic challenge by 30% as evidenced by the 2024 Youth Truth Survey.

Heritage High school will increase the overall Instructional Culture Index from 7.1 to 9.1. Heritage will improve domain scores for the hiring process and peer culture by 5 points (in each domain) as evidenced by the
2024 EDI Insight Survey.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators will monitor their assigned departments gradebook for weekly posts.
Department Chairs will conduct peer observations to ensure that standards-based instruction is occurring in all MESH courses.

Administrators will participate in Walk-through's, specifically looking for standard-based and grade-level instruction as well as common lessons and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jemma Sabokrouh (sabokrouh.jemmak@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Parents will be well informed and connected to all school-wide activities through various modes of communication such as Facebook, Blackboard Connect, FOCUS, e-mail/text, monthly school newsletters, weekly posts from teachers, and an updated school website.

The key ratings in the Youth Truth Survey that need improvement will be addressed with the reinforcement of standard aligned instruction, raising the rigor in daily instruction, and developing positive relationships with students.

The key ratings in the EDI Insight Survey that need improvement are the hiring process and peer culture. Specific interventions will include improved relationships and team building amongst colleagues and assigning a mentor to new employees as they go though the on-boarding process at the district and the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Establishing strong relationships and clear lines of communication at the beginning of the year sets a strong foundation for parent-teacher interactions, according to teachers. Marzano (2003) says students resist complying with expectations when there is no relationship with the teacher. Relationships are at the heart of all we do as teachers. Knowing how to build positive relationships with students is a cornerstone teaching skill. In order to ensure that the student is given clear and precise instructions, it becomes necessary to align instruction with standards. Standards ensure better accountability – holding teachers and schools responsible for what goes on in the classrooms.
Adults need to be part of a community of colleagues who support their growth. They need to feel safe to be vulnerable, to admit failings or mistakes and to trust that their colleagues are giving feedback in order to help them improve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

• Ensure that FOCUS and Google Classroom resources are available to all parents with relevant information.
• Utilize a variety of media outlets to communicate information to our Heritage families, such as Facebook, Blackboard Connect, FOCUS,
e-mail/text
• Teachers will post grades and correspond with parents on a weekly basis.
• Monthly department and PLC meetings will include specific standard-based action and lesson plans to ensure the consistency of common standard-based lessons and assessments.

• Teacher leaders and members of the leadership team will be part of the hiring process.
• Heritage will improve the hiring process by allowing teachers who are
waiting for the district on-boarding process to be completed to observe their peers and provide them with
curriculum tools to begin planning for their courses (pacing guides, textbooks, standards).
• A school-based mentor will be assigned to each new faculty member.

Person Responsible: Stephen Link (link.stephen@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working
each quarter or on a as needed basis.

• Strategic scheduling and data analysis were implemented to ensure
that students were placed in more rigorous courses.
• Teachers will scaffold instruction when necessary but will also provide
students with grade level material.
• The staff reunited on the first day of pre-planning at Urban Air for
"welcome back" team building activities
• The faculty barbeque took place on the last day of pre-planning as
teachers collaboratively participated in physical team building
activities.
• The principal has made an intentional effort to invite community
businesses and local churches to be part of the "Teacher Tailgates' at
each home football game. Building cohesive relationships with
students, parents, teachers and the community is a priority as
evidenced by the activities mentioned above.

Person Responsible: Stephen Link (link.stephen@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working
each quarter or on a as needed basis.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The rationale for choosing instructional practice specifically relating to math is due to both geometry and algebra 1 proficiency rates declining over 3 years. Geometry is the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 17% decline from 32% proficiency in 2022 to 24% proficiency in 2023. The 3- year data trend represents a decline in geometry proficiency from 41% proficiency in 2021, 32% proficiency in 2022 and 24% proficiency in 2023. We are significantly below both the state and district student proficiency rates, with the state having a 3-year trend from 45% to 50 %, to 48% proficiency and the district showing a 3- year trend between 50 and 51 % proficiency.
Algebra 1 is the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. 23% of the students at Heritage were proficient on the B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC, and students in the state of Florida showed 50% proficiency, leaving a 27% gap between Heritage and the state. The 3-year data trend has been somewhat inconsistent, with only 17% of the students being proficient on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2021 and increasing to 28% proficiency in 2022 and then a slight decline to 23% of the students being proficient in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measurable outcome will be a 30% increase in proficiency on the Geometry EOC, which will reflect at least 54% of the students achieving a level 3 or above .In addition, The measurable outcome will be a 30% increase in proficiency on the B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC, which will reflect at least 53% of the students achieving a level 3 or above.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Evidence of Implementation: Classroom Walk-throughs, PLC/Data Team Meetings, agendas of PLC Meetings, meeting notes/minutes reflecting items discussed, ESE Support Facilitation, and professional development opportunities, common assessments in geometry and algebra 1
Evidence of Impact: Student Achievement Data: student grades, B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC, PSAT math (grade 10)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

• Every teacher will continue to implement standard-based bell work during the first 5 to 7 minutes of class.
• Specifically, the algebra 1 and geometry teachers will use standard-based bell work.
• The math department will provide the science department with sample bell work and EOC type questions for implementation into specific scientific concepts.
• The science department will use strategies for schema-based instruction including assigning word problems as bell work that incorporate mathematical concepts (cross-curricular support).
• All geometry and algebra 1 instruction will be direct, explicit , and systematic.
• Lessons will be scaffolded and formatted using the Gradual Release of Responsibility model of instruction.
• ESE Support Facilitation services will be provided in both algebra 1 and geometry classes to work with

students one-on-one and in small groups.
• Collaborative and meaningful PLC discussions will occur monthly to assess student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to practitioners, "bell work," has benefits including : engaging students in short assignments or assessments, reviewing key concepts already taught, stimulating classroom discussion that supports the lesson, and identifying misconceptions and misunderstandings learners may have. The Gradual Release of Responsibility approach is centered around the idea that a teacher will model a skill or strategy for a few minutes, briefly allow students to practice with some support, and then release the students to begin practicing on their own. The goal of the GRR Framework is to provide appropriate instruction, moving students towards independence. Instructional Support is a positive, success-oriented program which uses specific assessment and intervention techniques to help remove educational or behavioral stumbling blocks for all students in the regular classroom. ESE Support Facilitation services ensure that our mainstream ESE students experience success in and out of the classroom. They work closely with students, teachers, parents, and other support personnel to implement goals, update and monitor accommodations for, and provide an overall support system for our students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

• Cross-Curricular Support: The math and science departments will
collaborate and previous geometry and algebra 1 EOC questions will be
provided and reviewed with the science team.
• During bell work, science teachers will help students recognize the
underlying structure of the problem, with the steps outlining the strategy
for solving problems.
• Geometry and algebra 1 teachers will implement daily standard-based
bell work, emphasizing strategies used to master the EOC.
• Geometry and algebra 1 teachers will develop and implement standard-
based lessons using the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework of
instruction.
• The department chair will hold teachers accountable for these
lessons through informal peer observations.
• ESE Support Facilitation services will be used in both algebra 1 and
geometry classrooms.
• After school, Panther Prep tutoring will be available to students 4 days a
week.
• Analyze common assessment data in PLC's to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Stephen Link (link.stephen@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working each quarter or on a as needed basis.

• Increase the number of administrative walk-throughs
• Prioritizing Standards
• Algebra 1 and geometry teachers will identify essential standards for their

courses and prioritize them for instruction throughout the year.
• Prioritizing standards will provide teachers with a clear focus for their
limited instructional time and allow them to deeply teach the content.
• Algebra 1 and geometry teachers will provide explicit instruction on each
priority standard and provide opportunities for students to practice with
new concepts.

Person Responsible: Stephen Link (link.stephen@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working
each quarter or on a as needed basis.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students With Disabilities at Heritage fell below the ESSA Federal Index of 41% for the past two school years. In 2019, the ESSA Federal Index for students with disabilities was 32% and a slight increase to 35% in the 2021/2022 school year. Both data points fall below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%, which is a the rationale for choosing this area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The students with disabilities at Heritage High School will no longer perform under the ESSA Federal Index of 41%. Our measurable outcome is that 42% or higher of the students with disabilities will be proficient in both math and reading.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Evidence of Implementation: Classroom Walk-throughs, meaningful PLC/Data Team Meetings, Agendas of PLC Meetings, IEP Meetings, MTSS, Tier 3 interventions, ESE Support Facilitation
Evidence of Impact: Student Achievement Data: student grades, FAST, Geometry and Algebra 1 EOC results, Read 180 Reading Inventory and Phonics Inventory

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Link (link.stephen@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ESE Support Facilitation: ESE support facilitation personnel will push into ELA and math classrooms with high ESE populations and will assist students in a small group and/or one-on-one setting. Ongoing assessments will be used to monitor the progress of these students and make necessary adjustments to individual student needs, and will drive and differentiate future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing assessments allow teachers to continuously monitor student progress and understanding. This information can be used to tailor instruction to meet individual needs, ensuring that all students are supported appropriately. Continuous assessment can be a motivational tool for students, as they see their progress and understand the connection between their effort and achievement. It can foster a growth mindset and active engagement in the learning process. Through small group instruction, teachers can also easily level the curriculum and provide multiple methods of learning. These are both key to creating an inclusive space while providing special education supports to students. Small group instruction is an effective option to help further differentiate instruction and focus on individualized learning opportunities for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

•During pre-planning, all faculty members were provided with professional development regarding, accessing PEER, identifying students with IEP's, their accommodations and the importance of attending IEP Meetings and providing case workers with adequate student progress.
•Schedules have been developed for 5 ESE support facilitation personnel so they will be able to push into ELA and math classrooms with high ESE populations and assist students in a co-teaching model, and/or small group or one- on-one setting.
•Analyze ESE student FAST, Geometry, Algebra 1 EOC data.
•Identify students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions
•Identify individual student IEP goals and accommodations
•Monitor students progress through FAST, Read 180, and System 44 (Tier 2 and 3 assessments).
•Implement a co-teaching model of instruction with ESE Support Facilitators and general education classroom teachers.

Person Responsible: Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working each quarter or on a as needed basis.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 9th Grade ELA data component showed the most improvement with a 9% increase in proficiency and our overall ELA proficiency improved by 4%. Heritage still has work to do in the area of instructional practice specifically relating to English Language Arts. The Students in the 10th grade have consistently performed below proficiency levels for the past 3 years. Proficiency rates in 2021 were 44%, dropping to 42% in 2022, and increasing to 44% in 2023. Instructional practice, specifically relating to 10th grade ELA must be an area of focus for Heritage, as passing the FAST in 10th grade is a graduation requirement.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measurable outcome will be that 55% of the students at Heritage will be reading on grade level. This increase in reading proficiency will be measured by the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be progress monitored with the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) in September 2023 and January 2024 for the purpose of driving instruction and providing parents and guardians with student progress. This information will be communicated to teachers, students, and parents within one week of taking the assessment. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students enrolled in Intensive Reading will also be progress monitored with the Read 180 Universal Reading and Phonics inventory 3 times during the school year. Common course English Language Arts classes will monitor student progress with common assessments and will analyze student data, collaborate with peers during PLC meetings to drive future instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

•Increased Administrative Walk-Throughs with the ELA department chair and/or the school literacy coach
•Peer Observations with informal feedback
•Meaningful PLC discussions
•Cross-Curricular Support
•Close Reading Strategies across all content areas
•Implementation of The Literacy Instruction Profile with ELA teachers: Practice profiles clearly define the best practices of core reading instruction in a way that is teachable, learnable, doable, and assessable in practice. These practice profiles are research-based, aligned to effective reading instruction, and related to Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Thinking (BEST) Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

More than one intervention is necessary to increase the overall reading and writing proficiency rate at Heritage. Every content area/subject will contribute to improve proficiency in both reading and writing. Finding the intersection of subjects in the classroom, known as cross-curricular teaching, is a practice schools across the country are implementing with their students. This method has proven to be effective for students of all ages. . The Close Reading strategy asks students to carefully and purposefully read and reread text. When students "close read," they focus on what the author has to say, what the author's

purpose is , what the words mean, and what the structure of the text tells us. This approach ensures that students understand what they have read. Skillful close reading is also an important foundation for helping students develop the ability to justify their claims in class discussions and writing assignments with specific evidence.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

• Administrators will provide the ELA teachers with specific classroom practices that they will be looking for when they walk through the ELA classrooms (Look-Fors).
• Administrators will conduct ELA walk-throughs and will provide teachers with immediate feedback regarding instructional practices.
• Teachers will observe their peers once a quarter to strengthen their
teaching practices and observe various instructional strategies.
• Teachers will reflect on and share the observed practices during PLC meetings, which will prompt meaningful discussions, resulting in improved instructional practices and increased student achievement.
• The literacy coach and the ELA department chair will provide content area teachers with subject specific literacy strategies on a monthly basis.
• Literacy strategies such as close reading: annotating and marking the text, responding to text dependent questions and deliberately rereading the text will be available to content teachers through video or modeling the strategy in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working each quarter or on a as needed basis.

• Literacy strategies will be used across all content areas and all teachers will continue to use close reading strategies because cross curricular reading support is essential in order to see reading proficiency across our campus.
• New teachers will be trained on how to use close reading strategies in their content area.
• Literacy Instruction Practice Profile Implementation

Person Responsible: Kavitha Tracy (tracy.kavitha@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 Assess what is taking place, what is working, and what is not working each quarter or on a as needed basis.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The Heritage leadership team met at the end of the summer before the start of the 2023/2024 school year to assess rising and incoming student needs. By doing so, the team was able to identify and modify personnel allocations, instructional materials, and technology resources to ensure that the needs of all of our students,

with a strong focus on our students with disabilities, were being adequately met. The team analyzed the current PAR and strategically built schedules to meet the various needs of our SWD population. Additionally, the team reallocated some of the teacher allocations to increase academic and behavioral support for students with disabilities. As a result, we currently have 4.5 ESE Support Facilitation Teachers, who provide support in the general education classes with a high ESE population. The AICE/Cambridge Program was able to fund those teacher positions that were reallocated.

Post Secondary Funds and ESSER Funds are currently used to pay for teachers to provide academic support to all students during after school tutoring sessions. Students have the availability to attend on their own or teachers can suggest they attend. Students with disabilities are strongly encouraged to attend as well as the lowest 25% performing students in ELA, geometry, and algebra 1. To ensure that all students have equitable opportunity to passing state assessments, ESSER and Post Secondary Funds will be used to pay for additional testing opportunities for 11th and 12th grade students who have not met state graduation requirements. Purchasing
additional PSAT and SAT NCR tests allow students to have every opportunity to be successful and continue with post secondary education.

The School Advisory Counsil (SAC) plays a fundamental part of implementing our School Improvement Plan due to the SAC budget that is provided. The SAC committee provides critical input regarding how our school allocates funding. The SAC budget is presented to the members at the initial meeting and the application process to receive funding is explained and adhered to in detail. Staff who desire additional resources for their classrooms go through an application process and present it to the board for approval. This process ensures that the funds are spent with a focus on increasing student achievement according to the School Improvement Plan.