

Brevard County Public Schools  
School Improvement Plan  
2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

South  
Heritage High School

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Mark Mullins  
John W. Tuttle

SAC Chairperson:

Steven McAnelly

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To provide programs, instill pride, and establish traditions that will create a heritage of life-long learners.

Vision Statement:

By embracing the Heritage social and academic cultures while implementing our school-wide initiatives, Heritage High School will be the "School of Choice" in Palm Bay.

**Data Analysis from multiple data sources:** (Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)

Heritage High School has identified writing as an area to focus on for school-wide improvement. The data that identifies writing as a needs area is illustrated through the following sources:

**FCAT Writes**

Both the mean score and percent of students scoring 4 and above indicate an alarming downward trend.

**SAT**

Having no longitudinal data, yet, we can only compare our past year’s averages to the state and national averages, of which Heritage has scored significantly below both averages.

**ACT**

In 2012, Heritage High School students averaged 6.5 on the essay portion of the ACT.

**Qualitative Sources**

Teachers in non-ELA courses feel that writing instruction and assessment was the responsibility of English teachers. Many teachers have stated that they don’t feel qualified to properly assess writing within their classrooms. Teachers of students in grades 9, 11 and 12 don’t express major concern for writing skills, as they are not pressured to perform in this area by a state assessment. By walk-through observations, it is notable that teachers are not having students respond in writing to complex texts.

**Best Practice:** (What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)

From the National Commission on Writing in America’s Schools and Colleges (2003): an “impressive positive correlation exists between the frequency of informative writing assessments and academic achievement in every subject area.” As a result, the Commission endorses writing across the curriculum: “Writing is not simply a way for students to demonstrate what they know. It is a way to help them understand what they know. At its best, writing is learning.”

According to Georgia State University’s *Writing Across the Curriculum*, “frequent informal writing opportunities along with sequenced formal writing assignments play an indispensable role in developing critical thinking skills, learning discipline-specific content, and building competence in the modes of inquiry and communication specific to each discipline and profession.”

In a 2006 report titled *Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals About College Readiness in Reading*, ACT identifies this inability as the decisive gap between college-ready and college-unready students. When measured by their understanding of various "textual elements" (such as main idea, word meanings, and supporting evidence), college-ready and college-unready students score about the same. The difference shows up on another measure: "The clearest differentiator in reading between students who are college ready and students who are not is the ability to comprehend *complex texts*" (p. 2).

**Analysis of Current Practice: (How do we currently conduct business?)**

In 2011-2012 Heritage High School hired a part-time writing coach whose responsibilities included training teachers in content area writing. The writing coach was successful in inspiring English teachers to utilize "Poetry Slam" in their classrooms, however, other subject area teachers did not receive the intended training and the correlation between Poetry Slam and writing scores has not become apparent. Unfortunately, budget restraints have not allowed Heritage to hire the writing coach position for 2012-13.

History teachers administered common Document Based Questions (DBQ's) six times during the school year, and English teachers administered a school wide writing prompt to all grade levels three times during the school year. Both showed improvement in scoring over time, but there remains a gap for teachers of all subjects on how to implement meaningful writing assignments in all subject areas.

**CONTENT AREA:**

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

**School Based Objective:** (Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)

Heritage High School will implement writing in response to subject area complex texts.

**Strategies:** (Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1. Experience	1. English/Language Arts teachers will develop writing strategies specific to the different subject areas so that all teachers can implement content area writing.	ELA Department	Year-long	0	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, DGP, PGPs
2. Training	2. District resource teachers will train Heritage teachers to integrate writing in response to subject area complex texts into their lessons.	Department Chairs, District Resource Teachers	Year-long	0	Lesson plans, Classroom walkthroughs
3. Training	3. Staff training on unpacking of the common core standards in which writing plays an integral role.	Curriculum AP	Fall 2012	0	Lesson plans, training follow-up
4. Training	4. Develop a three-tiered approach to professional growth that ties school improvement, departmental goals and needs and individual growth into school-wide goals and objectives.	Principal, Administrative team	Year-long	0	Walkthroughs, DGPs, PGPs
5. Time	5. Develop interdisciplinary collaborative teams and provide protected time for those teams to meet share and plan.	Administration, teachers	Year-long	0	Meeting attendance, peer observations

**EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection**

**Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes:** (Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)

Teachers will complete a school-year entry and exit survey in which they will indicate and increased frequency and comfort level of using and scoring writing in their subject area. Teacher PGP's will reflect their implementation of the school-wide writing component.

**Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations:** *(Measures of student achievement)*

Our expected outcomes for writing across the curriculum are:

- FCAT Writes: 50% of tested students will score 4 and above
- SAT written score will increase to meet the state average
- ACT student scores will increase to 6.8 average

Near the end of the school year, a student survey will show 90% of students reporting better preparedness for high-stakes testing due to the school's writing initiatives.

APPENDIX A  
(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3  Barrier(s):  Strategy(s): 1.	28.8% = 212 students	32.8% = 241 students
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading  Barrier(s):  Strategy(s):  1.	50.0% = 4 students	75% = 6 students

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	24.0% = 177 students	31% = 229 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	12.5% = 1 student	37.5 = 3 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	37.5% = 3 students	50% = 4 students
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	65.8% = 125 students	77.8% = 148 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	None	N/A
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p>		

<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p>White:</p> <p>Black:</p> <p>Hispanic:</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>36.1% = 114 students</p> <p>34.5% = 68 students</p> <p>37.3% = 59 students</p> <p>33.3% = 5 students</p> <p>0.0% = (out of 1 student)</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p>
<p><b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	<p>38.9% = 7 students</p>	
<p><b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	<p>37.6% = 169 students</p>	

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Listening/ Speaking:</b>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Reading:</b>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Writing:</b>			

Mathematics Goal(s): 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s):  Strategy(s): 1.		



<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b>  Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b>  Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b>  Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b>  Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b>  Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics  Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:  Baseline Data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White:  Black:  Hispanic:  Asian:  American Indian:		
<b>English Language Learners</b> (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
<b>Students with Disabilities</b> (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):  Strategy(s): 1.		

<b>FCAT:</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):  Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

Science Goal(s) (High School) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage

	number of students that percentage reflects)	information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):  Strategy(s): 1.		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  White:  Black:  Hispanic:  Asian:  American Indian:		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B  
(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level
--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

	Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<p>Barrier(s): Training, Time</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be trained by district personnel to unpack the math standards</li> <li>2. Teachers will be trained in content area literacy strategies by district personnel</li> <li>3. Teachers will be trained in content area writing by district personnel</li> <li>4. Teachers will be provided protected time to collaborate in “same course” teams</li> <li>5. Teachers will administer Algebra 1 EOC simulations three times before the actual EOC.</li> <li>6. All students are taking Algebra 1 instead of Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B to increase opportunities to test.</li> <li>7. All students not passing the Algebra EOC are placed in Liberal Arts Math “A”</li> <li>8. All individual PGP’s will include at least one math strategy toward departmental growth plans.</li> </ol>		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:	38.5% = 164 students	50% = 213 students
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	2.6% = 11 students	6% = 25 students

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
---	--	--

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.		
White:	57.5% = 108 students	55% = 108
Black:	62.3% = 76 students	59% = 72 students
Hispanic:	63.4% = 52 students	60% = 49 students
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	None	
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	67.8% = 59 students	64% = 56 students
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	Data not available	

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  White:  Black:  Hispanic:		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
------------------	--	---



Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  Goal 1:  Goal 2:			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  Goal 1:  Goal 2:			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  Goal 1:  Goal 2:			

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. \*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

**MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI** (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

During the 2012-2013 school year, Heritage High School will implement an Early Warning/Intervention Team consisting of a guidance counselor (Clement Mansion), reading coach (Joan Largie), and the school psychologist (Gisela Ubau). The mission of the team is to improve the school culture and climate to positively impact student academic achievement with the vision that all students will graduate from high school.

This comprehensive team is assembled to implement a Multi-Tiered Supports System (MTSS), more commonly recognized as Response to Intervention (RtI), to enhance student academic and behavioral performance within the academic setting throughout all cohorts. Students are identified by at-risk criteria such as: failing grades, excessive referrals, frequent tardiness, and absenteeism. The team meets once weekly to review students at-risk or in need of additional intervention. Students can be referred to the Early Warning/Intervention Team by teachers, administrators, parents, and/or guidance counselors.

Students requiring Tier 3 interventions are scheduled for an Individual Problem Solving Team (IPST) meeting. This problem-solving process is to further assist the classroom teacher and parents in designing and selecting strategies for improving student performance. IPST meetings are scheduled every 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday of each month. This problem-solving process requires full collaboration among the Early Warning/Intervention team along with parents/or guardians to identify a specific, measurable outcome. The process includes ensuring interventions are implemented with fidelity and

student progress is monitored to determine the student's response. Family engagement in the process is vital to ensure all information that might impact student success is considered. Again, the purpose of problem solving is to put in place a decision-making process that will lead to the development of instructional and intervention strategies with a high probability of success.

There are approximately 311 (17%) students of 1,806 identified as performing below academic expectations as evidenced by failing the 2012 FCAT 2.0. The identified students are placed into collaborative teams and provided mentorship from a teacher to provide additional motivational/educational supports designed to enhance student academic success. The Early Warning/Intervention team uses MTSS (RTI) to develop strategies designed to improve student academics and increase attendance. The Early Warning/Intervention team receives student referrals from teachers, administrators, parents, and/or guidance counselors almost weekly. One of the main functions of the team is to facilitate communication between home and school. Student attendance has been the most reoccurring referral to the team because it negatively impacts the student's academic achievement.

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:**

In 2012, Heritage High School earned the Silver Star and Gold Star for volunteer hours. While 206 students volunteered for 16,237.75 hours, 88 recorded parent volunteers earned the school 5,793.52 hours. Heritage has a goal to increase parent volunteerism by 3% in 2013.

Edline communication continues to be a major point of contact for parent involvement in student academic progress. 93% of teachers reported using Edline to communicate above and beyond the uploading of grades through Edline. Our goal is to have 100% of teachers using Edline to communicate beyond the posting of grades in 2013.

**ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)**

Each teacher is responsible for tracking and recording the attendance of their students. The attendance is recorded daily in every period. Reminders are sent by an administrator in the event that attendance has not been recorded or if errors have occurred.

In 2011-12, Heritage High School averaged 94% in attendance, 7% in excessive absences and 3% tardy. This school year our goal is to increase at least two percent on the attendance (96%) and decrease excessive absences and tardies to 5% and 1%, respectively.

One of the strategies we are implementing to reach our goal is to conference with students before they create an attendance issue. The students with past attendance issues have to meet with the deans before picking up their schedule. This strategy was adopted from the discipline procedure for tracking students with behavior issues.

**SUSPENSION:**

During SY 2011-2012 a total of 353 students were suspended from school, resulting in 1,193 lost instructional days. In an effort to reduce the number of lost instructional days the Dean's office has taken two important steps:

1. Conducted a classroom management training during preplanning week
2. Implemented a discipline ladder which includes earlier parental involvement for offenses which may require suspension from school

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only):**

In 2012:

- Credit retrieval: 243 classes successfully completed. 49 students in 1<sup>st</sup> semester/63 students in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester. Some of those kids were in both semesters so approx 75-80 kids.
- Drop outs: 5 students
- Students behind in credits: 228

In order to reduce the drop-out rate, Heritage High School has added one remediation instructional unit as the At-Risk Coordinator. This teacher monitors seniors at-risk for not meeting graduation requirements by working with counselors, students, and parents and track enrollment/progress in GPA, attendance, FLVS, Adult Ed, Credit Recovery, and FCAT.

Heritage High School also continues to have teacher mentoring of the lowest 25% reading students by collaborative teams. The goal will always remain to have no students drop-out.

**POSTSECONDARY READINESS:**

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Heritage High School accomplishes these goals through:

- Web pages set up for college and career planning
- Weekly college and career readiness seminars
- A college, careers, and scholarship presentation through every junior and senior English class
- Individual program of study meeting with every student 9-12<sup>th</sup> grade – to go over graduation requirements, class rigor, and entrance requirements for post-secondary education and/or career readiness
- College representatives scheduled to meet on our campus throughout the school year

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

The ACT Profile Report summarizing the class of 2012 ranked Heritage students at nine percent at meeting all 4 ACT benchmark scores for college readiness. Our goal is to raise this percentage to meet the state average for 2013.

In school year 2013, we are offering college readiness math and college readiness English. The total number of students in English college readiness is 89 and in Math, 205, which is up from 59 in English and 41 in math from 2012. We also have one-quarter of our current student population in pre-Aice or Aice classes.

A strategy to improve is to target students with 3.0 GPA's to take the PERT test so they can qualify for dual enrollment. In 2012, we had 12 full time BCC students, while this year, we have 55. Overall, we currently have over 200 students taking one or more BCC classes in grades 10-12 , which will increase our population's college readiness.