Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

50 HOLLAND CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Alison L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (71%) 2014-15: A (78%)
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	N/A

* 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 Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

50 HOLLAND CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	26%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To help all students develop skills, concepts, attitudes, and values which enable them to be successful members of society. (Revised 2016)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Looking toward our children's future with challenging learning experiences that will lead to success. (Revised 2016)

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alison, Samantha	Principal	As the principal, Mrs. Alison is responsible for effectively interpreting student data and communicating the strengths and areas of improvement to the Holland Elementary Stakeholders. She is an active member of the School Advisory Council and collaborates with the council in discussions and decisions to support the continual improvement of Holland Elementary. She effectively communicates the school improvement goals and the actions required for implementation. Throughout the school year she monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan to ensure that it is being done with fidelity and that it is a living, breathing document that can be adjusted to meet the changing needs of our school. Mrs. Alison also facilitates data team meetings to monitor student progress and actively acquires materials and resources, for teachers, to support their curriculum and instruction.
Aloise, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Aloise coordinates all aspects of the curriculum. She assists teachers in interpreting and implementing district-approved curriculum and corresponding implementation guides and resources. Mrs. Aloise observes teachers and provides feedback on how to implement standards-aligned, rigorous instruction. Additionally, she makes sure that teachers have the necessary resources to provide quality instruction to their students. She oversees the MTSS Leadership Team and the MTSS Co-Facilitators, and ensures that all students receive Tier 2 and 3 interventions as needed. Ms. Aloise addresses student discipline, maintaining school safety so that strong instruction can occur without interruption in classrooms.
McCormick, Pamela	Instructional Coach	Ms. McCormick plans and implements professional development that focuses on the school's instructional needs and is based on current research. She models research-based literacy instruction and observes and provides feedback to teachers. Ms. McCormick coaches and mentors colleagues to ensure that research-based reading programs, core and intervention, are implemented with fidelity. She recommends curriculum adjustments to meet the unique learning needs of individual children and ways to monitor student progress. Mrs. McCormick is an MTSS Co-Facilitator who works closely with the IPST and Leadership Team to ensure the walk-to-intervention program is running efficiently and effectively, and prescriptive interventions are occurring in both Tier 1 and 2 groups.
Burns, Alina	School Counselor	Ms. Corrigan supports the Social Emotional Learning at Holland Elementary as well as serving as MTSS Co-Facilitator, supporting the MTSS process. She is also the ESE and IPST coordinator, managing meeting schedules and necessary documentation. She assists teachers with documenting student needs and implementing plans to address behavioral and social-emotional needs. Ms. Corrigan meets with students on a regular basis to make sure they are feeling supported and provides guidance where they are struggling. She addresses Youth Mental Health and the SRI process, and oversees anti-bullying and SEL programs. Ms. Corrigan provides students the stability and support they need in order to focus on their academic studies.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	66	77	74	73	71	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	24	19	18	18	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
38

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	62%	57%	73%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	57%	53%	48%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	63%	63%	80%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	65%	62%	81%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	53%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	57%	53%	63%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	60 (0)	66 (0)	77 (0)	74 (0)	73 (0)	71 (0)	72 (0)	493 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	23 ()	24 ()	19 ()	18 ()	18 ()	16 ()	118 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	3 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	13 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	76%	60%	16%	54%	22%
	2018	81%	63%	18%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
	2018	63%	59%	4%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	85%	60%	25%	60%	25%
	2018	84%	58%	26%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
06	2019	91%	67%	24%	55%	36%
	2018	93%	68%	25%	52%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	52	50	50	59	60	33				
BLK	50			42							
HSP	67	59		70	100						
MUL	88			94							
WHT	72	65	39	83	78	57	75				
FRL	50	51	47	67	68	54	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	58	50	40	57	54	40				
BLK	60	75		40	58						
HSP	65	47		72	86						
MUL	80	69		73	69						
WHT	76	72	55	81	78	73	77				
FRL	53	65	52	63	67	75	25				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	40	39	41	58	61					
BLK	53	30		47	60						
HSP	64	60		71	70						
MUL	68	57		79	93						
WHT	78	68	56	85	83	76	66				
FRL	56	59	53	72	79	79	50				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

The lowest 25% cell in E.L.A. and Math showed the lowest performance in making annual learning gains. There are 47 students in the lowest 25% cell and of these students 33 of them are low income or are in an exceptional education program. Contributing factors could be that students coming from low income families may not have had the resources or exposure to literacy and therefore, started these students off with a language deficiency.

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

The lowest 25% cell in E.L.A. making annual learning gains showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 with a decrease of 10% and 6% respectively. A factor to this decline could be that differentiation needs to occur more frequently, as well as, a sharper focus on identifying student's specific instructional needs.

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.

The lowest 25% cell in making annual learning gains showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Holland students in this cell showed that only 42% made annual yearly learning gains as opposed to the state with a 53% making annual learning gains. A factor that could have contributed to this gap is how small-group instruction and questioning are structured.

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

Students in fifth grade showed the most improvement by making an 8% gain from 2018 to 2019 in meeting high standards for science. A new experience for our fifth-grade students was participating in the "A Day In The Life Program". This program features the simultaneous collection of scientific data by students using hands-on field techniques at various sites along the lagoon to learn firsthand how their local piece of the estuary fits into the larger ecosystem of the IRL. Students examined chemical, physical, and biological parameters to generate a snapshot of the overall health of the aquatic ecosystem and biodiversity of the lagoon.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

After reflecting on the E.W.S. data it appears that attendance is a potential area of concern.

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

1. Increase the number of students' making annual learning gains in the cell of the lowest 25%.
2. Increase the overall number of students' making annual learning gains in E.L.A.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA learning gains for all students, and specifically the lowest 25%.
Rationale	Four years of F.S.A. data indicates that Spessard L. Holland Elementary's lowest 25% has shown a decrease in learning gains in ELA. A significant decrease in 2017 and then another significant decrease in 2019. In addition, 2019 showed the lowest 25% making annual learning gains was below the district and state averages.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, the ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 42% to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data-driven instruction, along with a focus on self-assessed learners (students tracking their own progress) is the priority evidence-based strategy. School-wide, teachers will utilize student-performance data, along with the the At-A-Glance and Standards Focus Document to plan and execute a daily bell-to-bell, 90-minute, uninterrupted reading block that contains rigorous, standards-aligned learning tasks and instruction. Teachers will increase their use of explicit, direct instruction and conduct daily guided reading groups focused on complex texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It is speculated that one root cause of the lowest 25% population losing ground in learning gains could be due to a withdrawal of explicit, direct instruction to being one of inquiry-based, student-driven methods with the teacher as the facilitator. This shift occurred with the theory that allowing students the opportunity to discover skills and concepts on their own was a better practice. While students do need to have opportunities for inquiry-based strategies to enhance their learning, it is still necessary to provide explicit, direct instruction at the onset of lessons in order to provide students with the skill-base necessary to master standards. Additionally, there were shifts in teachers that may have also contributed to the decline, as well as an adjustment in the method of providing intervention in 5th and 6th grades. One last contributor may be an increased need for more consistent informal checks for understanding of ELA concepts.

Action Step	
Description	1. The leadership team will provide teachers with professional development and embedded coaching cycles on components that should occur everyday in the 90-minute reading block and in guided reading instruction. 2. The leadership team will plan weekly to discuss what is observed during walk-throughs and plan on how to provide feedback, modeling, and professional development to support teachers with improved practices. 3. Leadership team will conduct weekly walks focused on the reading block and specifically, guided reading occurring during small group instruction. 4. Lowest 25% students have been identified by teachers to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs so that they can better plan for instruction that will support the students' needs. Teachers will be required to discuss their progress at every data-team meeting. 5. High-effect-size instructional strategies, determined by Hattie's continuum of instructional strategies, will be focused on and embedded into E.L.A. instruction.

6. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on walk-through observational data.
7. Student data will be monitored on a bi-monthly basis with a focus on the lowest 25% cell.
8. i-Ready progress will be monitored.
9. 130 Instructional licences for i-Ready were purchased to support our lowest 25%.
10. General education teachers and exceptional student education teachers will attend collaboration training to better utilize their time and resources.
11. Data meetings will include provision of student work samples for analysis and discussion.
12. Teachers and the instructional coach will visit schools and classrooms to observe and plan with teachers who demonstrate highly-effective instructional practices.
13. Academic Support Program is going to take place during the school day. A certified teacher will be pushing into third through sixth grade classrooms to provide reading interventions to our lowest 25% students.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

NA