Heritage Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Heritage Middle School

1001 PARNELL CT, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/heritagemiddle/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Nicholas Fidance

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2020-21: (46%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Heritage Middle School will ignite a passion for learning while maximizing student potential one student at a time.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The spirit of Heritage Middle School embodies a community of students, parents and staff working together. We believe in providing a safe and secure student-centered environment that elevates respect and rapport and empowers all to soar to the highest levels of personal and academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fidance, Nick	Principal	
Dutil, Denielle	Assistant Principal	
leonard, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Robinson, Pamela	Assistant Principal	
Atkinson, Jami	Instructional Coach	
Bidwell, Elizabeth	Math Coach	
Coll, Jennifer	Science Coach	
Rayburn, Brenda	Reading Coach	
Glaspie, Holly	Instructional Media	
Scully, Michelle	Guidance Counselor	
Hemke, Kim	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Nicholas Fidance

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
30

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,023

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	344	330	340	0	0	0	0	1014
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	81	69	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	98	85	0	0	0	0	277
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39	27	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	46	14	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	154	138	0	0	0	0	416
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	140	112	0	0	0	0	386
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	78	60	0	0	0	0	173

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	114	127	111	0	0	0	0	352

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	6	12	13	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	338	348	354	0	0	0	0	1040
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	51	47	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	40	59	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	49	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	128	114	0	0	0	0	316
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	152	127	0	0	0	0	396
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	40	62	73	0	0	0	0	175

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	11	18	11	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	338	348	354	0	0	0	0	1040
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	51	47	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	40	59	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	49	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	128	114	0	0	0	0	316
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	152	127	0	0	0	0	396
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	40	62	73	0	0	0	0	175

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	11	18	11	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	11

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%			42%			46%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	36%			43%			51%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%			35%			43%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	42%			40%			50%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%			33%			54%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%			32%			45%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	55%			59%			58%	58%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	62%			57%			63%	71%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	52%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	50%	-4%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	63%	68%	-5%	71%	-8%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	54%	37%	61%	30%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	29	26	15	40	46	29	27			
ELL	18	29	35	24	45	41	33	50			
BLK	25	34	29	26	51	52	47	54	69		
HSP	32	36	33	41	54	55	51	61	78		
MUL	27	38		38	56		62	70			
WHT	47	38	32	50	53	49	62	65	84		
FRL	31	35	31	38	52	50	51	59	76		
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	28	30	10	27	27	17	25			
ELL	23	40	36	26	30	29	39	34			
BLK	30	34	39	29	25	24	51	49	75		

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
HSP	37	44	38	35	31	41	44	49	62		
MUL	52	52		36	32		75				
WHT	49	43	30	47	37	31	69	67	81		
FRL	38	39	32	36	31	30	58	51	68		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	38	37	16	42	40	25	28	80		
ELL	22	44	38	28	47	38	23	26	67		
BLK	38	42	19	35	48	41	52	43	79		
HSP	40	49	44	43	53	42	51	55	85		
MUL	33	43		53	32						
WHT	53	55	50	58	56	51	63	74	83		
FRL	41	50	39	46	53	44	51	56	81		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	49
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	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	53
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In math, 6th grade and Algebra increased by 8 points, while all other grade levels and geometry had no change in the percentage of students that are proficient. In ELA, 6th grade had no change, however, both 7th and 8th grades saw a decrease in students that are proficient (-5% and -10% respectively). Our students with disabilities ESSA subgroup increased overall from 26% to 29% of students are at a proficient level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 state assessment data, students with disabilities show the greatest need for improvement in ELA (13%) and Math (15%) achievement.
Based on progress monitoring data, students with disabilities compared to the entire school decreased in ELA from 54.9% to 38.4% and in math from 57.7% to 48.2%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

During the 2021-22 school year, Heritage had multiple vacancies within the ELA department and a high turnover rate among teachers. We started the school year with only two remaining ELA teachers.

Also, students and staff were still feeling the lingering effects of Covid as we struggled with ever-changing quarantining guidelines.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The 2022 state assessment data showed the most improved area in math in all reporting categories.

The percentage of students making learning gains in math increased by 20% and the lowest quartile of students making learning gains increased by 19%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In the 2021-2022 school year our math teachers were consistent and knowledgeable. The math PLCs focused on data-driven instruction which included learning interventions and remediation. Our math academic coach was able to track specific students and offer remediation as well as assist teachers in implementing different strategies that have the most impact on their instructional practices.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In the 2022-2023 school year, we will be discussing ELA strategies across all content area PLCs. The ELA academic coach will work directly with our other content area coaches to develop different strategies each month to share and implement within their daily lesson plans.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Heritage Middle School will facilitate several teacher-led book studies this year that focus on content and pedagogy. Heritage will also host the following professional leaning events for this school year:
*MTSS Trainings on 8-23-22, 11-2-22, 1-11-23, and 2-22-23.
*ESE Specific Topics and Accommodations on 8-31-22.
*Teaming on 8-23-22, 10-19-22, 12-7-22, 1-25-23, and 3-22-23.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teaming will also be a big are of focus for this school year, and teachers will meet with their teams multiple times each month to discuss their students and teaming features.
Finally, ELA Strategies will be disseminated to all staff at faculty meetings so that they can implement said strategies through all core classes.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our students scores in ELA have historically been low at Heritage Middle School. Our recent FSA scores showed a drop in ELA across the board: * Percentage of Students scoring Level 3 or higher: decrease of 6 points. * Percentage of Students making Learning Gains: decrease of 7 points. * Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: decrease of 4 points.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The outcome for 2022-2023 is to increase student achievement in ELA (literacy) 9% by incorporating literacy strategies through all core areas.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration and academic coaches will monitor implementation of the literacy strategies in all core areas via walk throughs and observations. Administration and Academic coaches will also monitor the intentional planning of literacy strategies through the core class in PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nick Fidance (ntfidanc@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Direct Instruction of reading/literacy strategies in all core subjects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	According to John Hattie's research, direct instruction has an effect size of 0.82.

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.

Disseminating current literacy strategies to all instructional staff through faculty meetings.

Person Responsible	Brenda Rayburn (bjraybur@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intentional planning and incorporating literacy strategies in all core lesson plans through PLCs each week.

Person Responsible	Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring implementation of literacy strategies throughout core instruction and provide ongoing feedback to teachers as needed.

Person Responsible	Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Analyze results of literacy gains through district and state assessments. Make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible	Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	Our ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities (SWD) is still below the Federal Index of 41%. While this subgroup did show signs of improvement from the previous year (up 3% overall), there is still a great need of improvement to get them moved to where they need to be.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase student achievement in math and ELA among our SWD. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, SWD will exceed the Federal Index of 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	ESE Administrator, ESE Department chair, and ESE case managers will conduct ongoing progress monitoring of all SWDs and identify areas of need and respond accordingly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The ESE department will implement a standards-based remediation plan where case managers will oversee their caseloads of students each week to ensure proficiency of standards through each core content area. ESE teachers will identify students not meeting proficiency in their core classes and pull those students out of elective courses each week (as needed) to provide intervention for the subjects needing additional support and reteaching of standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Based on John Hattie's research, interventions for learning disabled students has an effect size of 0.77.

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.

Identification of SWDs needing remediation (based on classroom grades and assessments) in their core subjects.

Person Responsible Nicole leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Creating a schedule/plan for those students to attend remediation each week on Wednesdays.

Person Responsible   Nicole leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE case managers and/or support facilitation teachers will oversee remediation for those identified SWDs until they are at or above proficiency.

Person Responsible   Nicole leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Maintain an ongoing progress monitoring system to evaluate student progress. Core subject grades will be monitored weekly. Overall progress toward meeting IEP goals will occur monthly.

Person Responsible   Nicole leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Heritage Middle School engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction. Heritage staff is responsible for setting high expectations for ALL students. Communication between all stakeholders is encouraged and practiced. Teachers engage in weekly PLCs, common planning, team meetings, and are provided support from academic coaches which help build positive and collaborative relationships among teachers. The PBIS Team regularly monitors discipline data and discusses ways to positively encourage and support students that are showing at-risk behaviors. The PBIS Team and administration also encourage staff recognition and student recognition. The Family Center plays a huge role in parental involvement by hosting events throughout the year that bring family members to the campus. Administration ensures the teachers have ongoing support, training, and proper resources to be successful. There is common language of rules and expectations in each classroom, based on PBIS practices. Family and community engagement is supported by a decision-making SAC that meets monthly to discuss what is working and what needs improvement. Students are able to express their interests in clubs, sports, and electives offered at Heritage. Local businesses provide discounts, grants, and monetary assistance when it is needed. Community is appreciated at Heritage

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Administration will analyze and interpret data to assist with planning and implementation of PBIS campus-wide. Instructional staff will practice restorative practices in the classroom. They will utilize consistent praises for good behavior and consistent discipline for poor behavior. Clear expectations will be present and consistent on campus. The district Behavioral Initiatives Specialist is active with the PBIS Team and assists in keeping the program effective. Students will actively participate in keeping their school a safe and clean environment. Guidance counselors will be readily available to support students with all their needs. Social and Emotional Learning activities are incorporated into each school day with activities structured in the first 10 minutes of each day. The Family Center will ensure students that are in need are provided resources they lack.