Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

2020-21 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: 7/18/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	27%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
Smith, Tonya	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Smith mentors new classroom teachers through lesson modeling, lesson plan design, lesson structures, and facilitation of peer observations. Mrs. Smith supports professional development, monitors i-Ready fidelity, passage rates, data development for progress monitoring and implementing an incentive program for i-Ready. She helps monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, is an active member of Data Team Meetings, and attends weekly leadership team meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/18/2016, Samantha Alison L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).	

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	54	55	49	67	57	61	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	5	2	4	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	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	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	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	1	2	2	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	5	7	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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

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**	
	(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.

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						

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	76	72	55	81	78	73	77				
FRL	53	65	52	63	67	75	25				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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
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%	0
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	46
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	74
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	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making annual learning gains in ELA is the data component with the poorest performance. There were 47 students in the lowest 25% cell and of those students, 33 of them were economically disadvantaged or were in an exceptional education program. Students with disabilities, in reading and math, are also an area in need of improvement. The ESSA federal index score for SWD (students with disabilities) is below 50%. For the last three years, our students with disabilities have been making slight progress, however, they are significantly lower in scoring level three or higher than their non-disabled counterparts. A potential contributing factor to this performance level could be a need for increased progress monitoring of the bottom quartile. Additional contributing factors could be that students coming from economically disadvantaged families may not have had the resources or exposure to literacy and therefore, began school with a deficit in language skills. In addition, strengthening the connection between identifying students' needs and providing prescriptive interventions may be an area of opportunity.

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

The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making annual learning gains in ELA and Math demonstrated the greatest decline from 2018-2019 with a decrease of 10% and 6% respectively. A factor that may have contributed to this decline could be that differentiation needs to occur more frequently, as well as, a sharper focus on identifying students' specific instructional needs, as mentioned above. i-Ready instructional licenses were purchased for the lowest 25% in grades 1-6, after the initial i-Ready Diagnostic in August 2019. The second i-Ready Diagnostic was taken in December of 2019 and indicated an 84% increase in growth. Of the lowest 25%, 56% made growth, and 44% regressed, as evidenced by i-Ready Diagnostic 1 in 2019 to Diagnostic 1 in 2020.

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.

While we are working on increasing achievement across all areas and with all students, our Students with Disabilities and African American student achievement gap are the greatest areas of need according to the ESSA Report and data trends on standardized state assessments for the last few years. Annual learning gains for the lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Only 42% made annual learning gains as opposed to the state, with 53% making annual learning gains. A factor that could have contributed to this gap is how small-group instruction and questioning are structured, in conjunction with the need for prescriptive instruction/intervention which has been identified already. Enhancing researched-based best practices and providing on-grade level rigorous text with scaffolding during small group instruction will help close this gap.

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, in 2018-2019, 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 Indian River Lagoon. Students examined chemical, physical, and biological parameters to generate a snapshot of the overall health of the aquatic ecosystem and biodiversity of the lagoon. There has also been a concerted effort to emphasize the importance of science instruction in grades three and four. Third and fourth-grade teachers are aware of the science standards that are taught in the respective grade levels and then assessed in fifth-grade. Ensuring that target science skills are taught in third and fourth grades, in conjunction with strong, hands-on instruction in grade five, is showing an increased success rate for fifth graders as evidenced by the NGSS State Science Assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

A potential area of concern is the percentage of identified students with attendance below 90 percent. This continues to be a struggle in these unprecedented times. Teachers are monitoring student attendance and are making contact with parents. If a student has been absent for three days or more, the front-office clerk will also contact parents. If the absences are continuing, the teachers refer cases to our guidance counselor who will also try to make contact with families, and subsequently initiate the truancy process.

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

1. Increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making annual learning gains.
2. Increase the overall number of students making annual learning gains in E.L.A.
3. Increase the implementation and use of Restorative Practices throughout the school.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA learning gains for all students, and specifically, the lowest 25% is our main area of focus for school improvement. Data indicates a downward trend in the number of students making annual learning gains in this area. Additionally, we have seen a decrease in the number of overall students making annual learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 42% to 52% as evidenced by the FSA ELA in 2021. During the 2020-2021 school year, the ELA learning gains for all students will increase from 65% to 75%, as evidenced by the FSA ELA in 2021. During the 2020-2021 school year, 80% of our student population will meet annual typical growth gains, as evidenced by the EOY i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Holland will continue with data-driven instruction, along with a focus on self-assessed learners (students tracking their own progress). Teachers will utilize grade level, rigorous materials for all students while supporting struggling students with scaffolding strategies. Holland made a concerted effort last year to reinforce the use of high-yield strategies, according to Hattie's research, to improve learning gains. This year we will continue implementation with increased fidelity and regularity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Previous years' data indicates a need for explicit guided reading instruction for our lowest 25%. Couple that with the loss of five months of face-to-face instruction, and we may have students who have lost significant ground in their learning. In order to close the achievement gap for our lowest 25%, more targeted intervention support will be provided for all our students including our SWD. Holland has strengthened its MTSS processes and procedures to bring a detailed focus and approach to interventions for our subgroups. Coaching in the use of a research-based intervention program, The 95% Group, and ongoing progress monitoring will benefit all students including the lowest 25%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Literacy Leadership Team developed criteria for look-fors centered around Data and Assessment, Literacy Block, Rigor, and Writing. Teachers will utilize the Look-Fors, At-A-Glance, and Enhanced Standards focus documents to engage and challenge students in grade-level appropriate tasks, and strengthen Tier 1 reading instruction.

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

2. The Literacy Leadership Team will provide professional development in the areas of Data and Assessment, Literacy Block, Rigor, and Writing starting at pre-planning and continuing throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

3. The leadership team will conduct weekly walks focused on the reading block and specifically, prescriptive guided reading lessons targeting deficiencies, occurring during small-group instruction. The administration will be looking for small, guided reading group lessons for all subgroups, anchor charts, standards-focused boards, and that all elements of the At-a-Glance Document are included in the reading

block. Administrators will assess teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth and increases in student achievement.

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

4. Scheduled Data Team Meetings will ensure that all intervention data is reviewed to determine areas of concern in order to provide timely and specific feedback for all students. The lowest 25% have been identified by administration and will be shared with teachers to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs so that they can plan for data-driven instruction that will support students' specific needs. Teachers will discuss progress and interventions at every data team meeting.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

5.High-effective-size instructional strategies, based on research outlined in "Visible Learning", by John Hattie, will be embedded into ELA instruction.

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

6.Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on walk-through observational data.

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

7. i-Ready progress will be monitored on a monthly basis, by teachers and a schoolwide incentive program implemented.

Person Responsible   Tonya Smith (smith.tonya@brevardschools.org)

8. The Academic Support Program will be provided for our lowest 25%, outside of the school day.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

9. i-Ready online reading instructional program will be implemented for all students from kindergarten through sixth.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

10.Teachers will post standards and refer to the standard at the onset of each lesson. With exceptions made for hybrid e-learning teachers who travel to different classrooms.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

11. The Literacy Leadership Team will support classroom teachers with planning and modeling lessons and tasks to ensure students have the tools they need to understand complex text.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

12. Activity teachers will support classroom teachers through implementing standards and skills into their specific area whenever possible.

Person Responsible   Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Objective 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.), the following will be implemented: Increase and broaden our use of Restorative Practices throughout the school and Conscious Discipline in grades Kindergarten through Second Grades.

Holland's teachers responded to the annual Insight Survey given in the winter of 2019, which is an index used by the district to measure the school's culture, which serves as a leading indicator for student achievement and teacher retention. The domains with the strongest scores were School Operations 8.4, Hiring 7.7, and Observation and Feedback 7.3. An area of opportunity is in Professional Development 6.5. We will continue to provide PD in i-Ready and standards-based instruction; however, we are strengthening our PD by having a laser focus on desired outcomes. In order to support teachers' opportunities for PD enabling them to develop new skills that can be implemented immediately in classrooms, we will utilize our Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) to provide site-based training including demonstrations of what effective teaching of rigorous content looks like. Look-Fors were created by the LLT identifying strategies to increase achievement and are part of the PD provided to teachers.

The Brevard Parent Survey showed an overall customer satisfaction with Holland's faculty and staff, environment, and academics. The only areas of concern were student behavior and discipline. This perception could be caused, in part, by Holland serving foster group home students who sometimes exhibit inappropriate behaviors. The CPI Team met in response to this data, and created a process for responding to and de-escalating behavioral situations.

In January of 2020, a team was selected to attend Restorative Practices training. The team conducted PD for the faculty during preplanning. The objectives were to define the term "restorative practices", the elements of affective statements and classroom circles, practice affective statements and classroom circles, and develop a plan for implementing Affective Statements and classroom circles. We will continue to improve the strategies learned and ensure pervasive implementation. Restorative Practices is a system of formal and informal processes that build and sustain a culture of kindness, respect, and responsibility. This is achieved by emphasizing the importance of trusting relationships.

Conscious Discipline provides an array of behavior management strategies and classroom structures that teachers can use to turn everyday situations into learning opportunities. Loving Guidance, Inc. (2019) Conscious Discipline training was introduced during pre-planning and kindergarten through second-grade teachers will complete the training throughout the 2020-2021 school year. There is already a level of understanding and some implementation of Conscious Discipline at Holland.

Students at Holland Elementary were surveyed in January 2020 about their perceptions of their school. The highest-rated areas were Culture and Engagement. The areas with the greatest growth opportunities were Instructional Methods and Relationships. Our Literacy Leadership Team is focusing on the instructional practices to include high-yield strategies according to Hattie's research. Restorative Practices and Conscious Discipline are meeting the need for stronger relationships at school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.