Harbor City Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Harbor City Elementary School

1377 SARNO RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Christine Boyd E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	
* 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

Harbor City Elementary School

1377 SARNO RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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.

Our purpose is to create a safe environment where students are inspired to be lifelong learners and where everyone makes a difference.

(revisited 2018)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students who rise above;
Teachers who go beyond!

(revisited 2018)

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Salamone, Joy	Principal	School Leadership Team, monitoring progress monitoring, data collection, ESSA subgroup data identification and collection, instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision making process, manage and administer the instructional program so as to ensure all students have the opportunity to learn, instructional coaching, and professional development.
Lanterman, Tami	Assistant Principal	Discipline data and intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, assist teachers in organizing classrooms for effective learning, implement and schedule all standardized testing, assist teachers in interpreting and implementing the district's curriculum and School Leadership Team.
Brown, Audra	Instructional Coach	School Leadership Team, professional development, awareness of current research and curricular trends, model lessons which incorporate appropriate instructional strategies in whole and small group, coach and mentor colleagues, work with teachers to ensure that research-based reading programs (comprehensive core reading programs, supplemental reading programs and comprehensive intervention reading programs) are implemented with fidelity and train teachers in data analysis and using data to differentiate instruction.
Tingle, Matt	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team, plan and organize for appropriate instruction, utilize a variety of instructional techniques to meet the individual needs of students, evaluate student's progress on a regular basis, use appropriate Instruction strategies and materials that reflect each student's culture, learning styles, ESE needs and socioeconomic background and train teachers in data analysis and using data to differentiate instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Christine Boyd E

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.*
0

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

368

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	48	55	42	50	46	37	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	6	10	10	8	9	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	0	1	5	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	8	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	1	4	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/14/2021

2020-21 - 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	51	53	50	45	41	38	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	16	8	8	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	2	2	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	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	2	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

2020-21 - 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	51	53	50	45	41	38	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	16	8	8	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	2	2	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	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	2	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	62%	57%	51%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	60%	58%	42%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	57%	53%	30%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	63%	63%	56%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	65%	62%	67%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	53%	51%	61%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	57%	53%	51%	57%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We will use the 2020-2021 i-Ready Progress Monitoring Data for Diagnostic 1 (Fall), Diagnostic 2 (Winter) and Diagnostic 3 (Spring) for 1st-6th grades.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/31%	17/33%	20/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/31%	12/34%	13/37%
	Students With Disabilities	3/25%	3/25%	7/58%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/31%	13/25%	27/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/29%	8/23%	19/54%
	Students With Disabilities	2/17%	2/17%	7/58%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/41%	16/43%	18/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/30%	17/57%	21/70%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	3/75%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/30%	15/41%	19/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/17%	8/27%	12/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/34%	24/51%	32/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/40%	12/40%	14/47%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/8%	2/15%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/26%	11/23%	20/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/27%	11/37%	12/50%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/8%	3/23%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/52%	18/36%	26/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/46%	15/38%	21/54%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	2/25%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/20%	8/16%	18/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/18%	6/15%	14/36%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	1/13%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/21%	18/42%	27/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/16%	11/35%	19/61%
	Students With Disabilities	2/20%	3/30%	4/40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/7%	13/30%	24/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/6%	9/29%	15/48%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	2/20%	3/30%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/13%	27/48%	39/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/15%	22/55%	31/78%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	4/25%	3/19%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/16%	23/41%	32/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/15%	17/43%	25/63%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	2/13%	7/44%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

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	28	48	47	44	48	31	31				
ELL	38			54							
BLK	15			52							
HSP	44	40		40	53						
WHT	56	52		66	70		56				
FRL	43	47	54	55	60	46	45				

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	26	42	32	40	63	54	29				
ELL	54	69		69	79						
BLK	22	33		39	47						
HSP	68	71		64	65						
MUL	20			40							
WHT	64	58	56	66	57	40	66				
FRL	51	55	38	59	54	46	49				

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	24	36	43	33	48						
BLK	29	35		33	59						
HSP	48	50		56	69						
WHT	56	42	22	59	69	58	56				
FRL	51	41	25	53	65	59	49				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	60
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Third grade ELA showed the largest gap compared to state and district data; HCE: 42.6%, District 59.6%, and state 54.4%; 17% and 11.8%, respectively.

We administered the IReady Fall D1 Diagnostic for 2021-2022 in September for grades 1-6. 41% of our 3rd-6th graders are at proficiency in reading. This puts more than half our students at least one grade level behind.

African Americans scoring level 3 and above on the ELA portion of the test have dropped to 12.5% from 20% in 2019 and 27.3% in 2018 and from 51.4% in 2017. In four years, this subgroup has gone from scoring 51.4% to 12.5% at level 3 or higher!

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

47% of students in ELA FSA scored proficient; this shows that our campus needs support improving reading instruction.

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

Our greatest gap compared to state average—ELA L25%--HCE 44%, FL 53%--19 percentage point difference.
We believe that our Tier I instruction is solid and working well and that the new Benchmark Advance/ Savvas ELA curriculum will provide high quality materials to support explicit instruction of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Collaborative planning has helped us find research-based programs to support all students through daily Walk to Interventions. All students are assigned small working groups 30 minutes twice a week based on their individual IReady

diagnostic. All students are expected to complete five lessons of ELA in Iready weekly to increase the opportunity for all students to recover lost instructional time due to the pandemic. The Literacy Coach, teachers and MTSS team work collaboratively to plan and analyze the interventions put into place for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups; students are moved to new groups as the data reflect. We noticed that phonics and vocabulary were weak areas and had purchased these programs (Crack the Code, Lucy Caulkins Phonics) for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups for the 2020-2021 school year; we will continue this for 2021-2022 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Improvements:
-Our most improved - ELA L25% (The Learning Gains among the lowest 25% in ELA were 13 percentage points higher than the District Average).
-To support our lowest 25% of learnings in ELA, we added new programs (Crack the Code, Lucy Caulkins Phonics) for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups for the 2020-2021 school year to provide added support for all students through daily Walk to Interventions.
- All students are assigned small working groups for 30 minutes daily based on their individual i-Ready diagnostic. The Literacy Coach, teachers and MTSS team work collaboratively to plan and analyze the interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups; students are moved to new groups as the data reflect.

Math Improvements:
-Overall FSA math scores (3-6) beat the District average in all the following categories: Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, and Math Lowest 25%.
-5th grade students on the FSA math scored 7.9 percentage points higher on the 2021 FSA than on the 2019 (63.8% vs. 55.9%)
-64% of our students in grades 5-6 made a learning gain which was 22 percentage points higher than the District Average on the 2021 FSA Math.
-For the fourth year in a row we increased our percentage of level 5 students in math.
-On the FSA MATH assessment our African American students had a 9-percentage point increase in the category of level 3 and above (2019 was 35% to 44% in 2021).

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

The FSA ELA 13 percentage point advantage is evidence that the increased focus of Walk to Intervention time is effective in getting students additional time and resources to fill their learning gaps. The FSA Math improvements are evidence that our Math Party strategy has a high impact on success. The concept is an extra 40 minutes of math three times a week--students and parents agree to give up student activity when they do not have Physical Education and go to extra math instruction for two months. The purpose of this strategy is to frontload, reteach, and/or practice skills with our lowest learners in grades 4, 5, 6.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%. - Walk to Intervention implemented daily for 30 minutes with targeted instruction and the addition of instructional materials purchased through the High Quality Instructional Materials Grant.
2. Gap between reading learning gains and math learning gains. - Addressed based on 5 i-Ready lessons for every student each week in ELA and Math. Teachers participating in 90 minute planning session with the support of Title 1 and the Literacy Coach.
3. Monitor and adjust as needed learning gaps between whites and blacks and whites and multi-racial students, and students with disabilities and non-disabled students - Focusing on subgroups during

campus data chats and 90 minute planning for teachers with the support of Title 1 and the Literacy Coach.

4. Monitor Level 4 and 5 students to maintain and increase status. - Targeted Walk to Intervention instruction to accelerate learning in ELA and 5 Zearn lessons per week to align with prerequisite of core instruction in math.

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.

Benchmark Advance training and support from the Literacy Coach was provided during pre-planning and will be continued throughout the school year to support Tier 1 instruction. The Literacy Coach will support classroom teachers through modeling and providing feedback and strategies to enhance student learning in ELA. The Vision for Excellent Instruction will be addressed continually with the faculty.

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

Walk to Intervention will be provided and is built into our master schedule to ensure that all students on the campus are receiving small group instruction targeted to their needs to either close the gap or enhance learning. Title 1 Instructional Assistants will provide small group instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SY20-21 FSA data show 47% students performing at proficiency (3+) compared to the state average 53% and the district average 59%. -ELA shows a decline in our level 3, 55.6% to 47.2%, -Level 4 and above grew two percentage points from 19.3% to 21.3%, -The learning gains among the lowest 25% in ELA were 13 percentage points higher than the District average, -5th grade was the only group that increased scores in ELA, -Level 3 or higher --African Americans--12.5% (2017 51.4%) staggering decline in a four year period. We will continue to monitor the gap in student achievement as defined in ESSA between all subgroups with emphasis on the noted higher gap between white students and African American students. We will also monitor our students with disabilities and non-disabled students as reflected in our School Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) Plan. We will administer the i-Ready Growth Monitoring Tool for our students to assess the progress among our subgroups as defined in ESSA; our African American students are specifically targeted for ELA strategies to increase their individual learning. The gap increased this year with our African American students. At home learning seems to have had a negative impact on our students as we saw bigger decreases in all areas with most of our students. We believe having students back in school will have a positive impact on our student achievement in 2021-2022.
	ELA proficiency (+3 and above) grades 3-6 will increase as measured by FY22 FSA ELA assessment from an average of 47% to 60% . – increase proficiency rates on FY22 ELA FSA to at least 50% in grades 3 (43%), 4 (46%), and 6 (43%). ELA proficiency (meeting benchmarks) grades K-2 will increase as measured by IReady reading assessment from an average of 23% to 60%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA 3rd and sixth grades showed the lowest performance at 43%. The only grade level that showed improvement in Level 3 and above scores was 5th grade. BPS has purchased a new reading program for grades K-6 and we believe that if we follow the program with fidelity at all levels we will see reading improvement. Our writing scores show an average of less than 6 of 10 indicators for student success so we determined that Write Scores (T) needed to be administered for three data points during this school year. This will allow us to put in place effective research-based strategies for success for individual students as we monitor their success throughout the school year.
Monitoring:	Ongoing monitoring through the following measures will be done: i-Ready Diagnostic Growth (3X yearly) in Reading. i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments in Reading for 2nd to 6th grade. Write Score (3X yearly)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:	--Core curriculum, BPS has purchased new reading programs (Benchmark Advance/ Savvas) for grades K-6 and we believe that if we follow the programs with fidelity at all levels we will see gains in reading as the program is evidence-based and follows the B.E.S.T. strategies. --Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies-- research based programs of explicit instruction-- Crack the Code, Lucy Caulkins Phonics, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness. -- Intervention resources being provided through the High Quality Reading Materials Grant; i.e. Lexia, 95% group, Read Naturally. -- All students are assigned small working groups for 30 minutes daily based on their individual i-Ready diagnostic. --The Literacy Coach, teachers and MTSS team work collaboratively to plan and analyze the interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups; students are moved to new groups as the data reflect. --We will continue to plan and implement training for all teachers in the BPS Excellent Instruction model for teaching. --Teachers will share with each other at faculty meetings. We will continue monthly instructional rounds within our school, grade level to grade level. --Walkthroughs by the leadership team and follow-up feedback sessions will be completed weekly. -- Bi-weekly data chats will review data with teachers of i-Ready Math and Reading to measure student progress. --A tri-annual review of student data from formal assessments (i-Ready, Standards Mastery Testing) will support our monitoring efforts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	--Core curriculum, BPS has purchased new reading programs for grades K-6. The programs are evidence based to address the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. -- We have three instructional assistants (T) to support our strategies to close the learning gaps we see in our students as evidenced in the i-Ready scores at every grade level. --We will also use the i-Ready Growth Monitoring Tool to check on success along the way. Through frequent classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations and conferences, the leadership team will determine whether the instruction being delivered is being done so with fidelity to the new ELA program, making adjustments as needed. --We monitor data in biweekly data chats with all teachers as another tool to measure alignment of standards to instruction to assessments. --Teachers are provided on-going professional development opportunities on campus and off-site to improve their instructional practices. Classroom teachers are provided opportunities to observe highly-effective teachers delivering standards-aligned instruction. --Teachers meet in collaborative teams to create, plan, and implement lessons learned via the various professional development opportunities --Additionally, teachers present effective strategies and teaching techniques during faculty meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

--Leadership Team will provide teachers with an additional 90-minute common planning time per month facilitated by the Literacy Coach (.5 T) and Title 1 Teacher (T) to build standards-based ELA lessons.
--ELA Coach (.5 T) and Title 1 Teacher (T) will provide an agenda for the additional 90-minute common planning time per month, to guide grade level teachers with ELA standards focused planning/text-based writing strategies.
--The teachers will share scaffolding strategies being used for student success.
--Leadership Team will monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups, which includes school wide Walk to Intervention (WTI).
--We will use the i-Ready Growth Monitoring Tool to assess success along the way.

Person Responsible Mallory Diehl (Diehl.Mallory@brevardschools.org)
--Leadership Team along with grade level teams will conduct monthly walkthroughs focused on the Brevard Vision for Excellence Instruction.
--Leadership Team members will collaborate and analyze data and student instructional tiers with teachers bi-weekly for targeted coaching support with Literacy Coach and Title I Teacher.

Person Responsible   Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our greatest improvement - 5th grade FSA Math - 63.8% from 55.9% L3 and higher. As teachers and the leadership reviewed the most current data from i-Ready we noted that students were showing a good increase in their math scores at all grade levels, however, a large percentage, 58%, of our students are scoring one grade level below their grade placement as we start this school year. We continue to monitor the Level 4 and Level 5 students based on FSA and noted that our Level 1 students had decreased by 32% overall in grades 4 and 5. Therefore, based on this data from i-Ready we determined that we would continue with the strategies we had set in place when the district went to eLearning in the Fall of 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. TRENDS in the DATA: -Math continues to be a strong area for our students. On the last two FSA Math Assessments (2019 & 2021) 61% of our students were level 3 or higher. -Continued to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and 5 in Math. Strengths/Successes: -5th grade students in Math scored better on the 2021 FSA than on the 2019. MATH: 63.8% vs. 55.9% -Our overall FSA Math scores (3-6) beat the District Average in all the following categories: Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, and Math Lowest 25%. -64% of our students in grade 5-6 made a learning gain which was 22 percentage points higher than the District Average. -For the fourth year in a row we increased are percentage of Level 5 students in Math. -On the FSA Math assessment our African American students had a 9-percentage point increase in the category of level 3 and above (2019 was 35% to 44% in 2021). Weaknesses/Areas of concern: -Our Hispanic students scoring Level 3 and above on the FSA Math declined 20.1-percentage points. -On the past three FSA assessments our African American students have scored below the critical 31% benchmark established by the ESSA. Mathematics Achievement - Harbor City 61%, District 54% (+7 above District), Mathematics Learning Gains - Harbor City 64%, District 44% (+22 above District)) and Mathematics Gains of the Lowest 25% - Harbor City 44%, District 37% (+7 above District).
Measurable Outcome:	It is our goal to raise student achievement in Math at all levels. The data displays an increase in our FSA Math scores: Goals for 2021 Math FSA: Grade 03 2022 60% 2021 52% 2019 78% Grade 04 2022 60% 2021 59% 2019 62% Grade 05 2022 60% 2021 64% 2019 56% Grade 06 2022 60% 2021 51% 2019 52%
Monitoring:	We will use Eureka Math in grades K-6, Zearn.com and Math i-Ready Tool box for improvement at all levels. We are using Title I dollars to purchase an on-line program Reflex (T), in third grade to help with basic math facts, as in looking at 3rd grade i-Ready scores teachers expressed concern that many student errors were simple fact mistakes.

Our Title I Teacher (T) and assistants (T) work directly with groups of students daily to improve math skills. In January, our Title I teacher will add math party extra support time, to our week, this is a pull out program in 4th, 5th and 6th grades for our lowest math students. Students meet with teacher for 40 minutes three times a week to work on extra math strategies to strengthen attitude and performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

--We will use the three (3) I-Ready Math Diagnostics, four (4) i-Ready Standards Mastery and i-Ready Growth ----Students will complete five (5) I-Ready Math lessons per week with a passing goal rate of 80% or higher, which monitors each student's math progress at their grade level.
--Teachers will meet in data chats bi-weekly to plan collaborativly the Eureka math lessons and Zearn practice to align with core curriculum.
--Teachers will have an extra 90 minute planning biweekly with math coach with specific emphasis on subgroups strategies for success and progress.
--Math party, a strategy for our lowest 25%, students, in small groups, by grade level work with teacher and assistant for 40 minutes (activity time, not P.E) three times a week from January-May, to improve math skills. This is to practice, reteach, and/or frontload grade level benchmarks depending on the data from the weeky required five lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Third grade FSA Math scores went from Level 3 and above at 78% in 2019 to 52% in 2021 (-26), Fourth grade FSA Math went from Level 3 and above at 62% in 2019 to 59% in 2021 (-3), Fifth grade went from Level 3 and above at 56% in 2019 to 64% in 2021 (+8) and Sixth grade FSA Math went from Level 3 and above at 52% in 2019 to 51% in 2021 (-1). We will use Eureka Math (T) in grades K-6 and Zearn.com for math improvement at all levels.
--We are using Title I dollars to purchase an on-line program Reflex (T) in third grade to help with math facts.
--Eureka Math Workbooks will be purchased with Title 1 dollars for 6th Grade (T) to help students get the same content in a more consistent format for learning as in Grades K-5.
--Our Title I Teacher (T) and assistants (T) will work directly with groups of students in Walk to Intervention small groups to improve skills.

Action Steps to Implement

--Leadership Team will provide teachers with an additional 90-minute common planning time per month facilitated by the Title 1 Teacher (T) to build standards based Math lessons.
--Our Math Coach uses this time to set instructional plans for the month with grade levels. He works directly with teachers modeling, coaching, and monitoring instruction.
--The Leadership Team will monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups, which includes school-wide walk to intervention.
--We will continue to plan and implement training for all teachers in the BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction model.
--We will conduct Professional Development (T) as part of our training on the new B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA and the MAFS Standards and our results from annual comprehensive assessment tools.
-- Teachers will share with each other at faculty meetings.
--Our bi-weekly data chats will review data with teachers of i-Ready Math and Reading at all grade levels to measure student progres
--A tri-annual review of student data from formal assessments (i-Ready, i-Ready Standards Mastery, i-Ready Growth Monitoring, Eureka Mid and End of Module Assessments, District Math) that support our

monitoring efforts.
--Purchase additional computers to support students' needs related to iReady, Zearn, and Reflex.

Person Responsible Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

1. School Safety: monthly meetings with SEOP team to collaborate and verify precautions are in place.
2. External stakeholder relationships: Continue to provide time and information for families to meet with staff and learn with their children as we provide curriculum nights. (T)
3. Harbor City Elementary will continue the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (T) program to encourage excellence in student academics, attendance, and behavior. PBIS supports the recognition of positive behaviors while intervening to correct problem behaviors. This program is a collaborative, research-based approach used to develop a positive culture in our school and the community. We will continue to offer school supplies and offer PBIS incentives to our students. Students will get to shop at the Dolphin Mart (T) every nine weeks to purchase items with their dolphins(T).

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.

Harbor City addresses building a positive school culture and environment by offering: 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.

The main way Harbor City addresses building a positive school culture and environment with our students is by using a Positive Behavior Interventions and Systems (PBIS). PBIS is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. The school's stakeholders came together to determine the students' and teachers' expectations throughout the campus. The expectations are modeled and posted in every room. A PBIS team has also been established to review data and make suggestions. This team meets once a month. Since, switching to a PBIS model the culture and environment at Harbor City has improved tremendously!

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

Harbor City values building positive relationships with all of our stakeholders: parents/families, teachers, and community members. This is accomplished by involving all stakeholders in planning, reviewing and improving our school. During these times all stakeholders' ideas, suggestions, and solutions are equally valued and respected. Stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process of our School Improvement Plan (SIP), the Title 1 plan, the Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), the Compact, our Comprehensive Needs Assessments (CNA) and other important areas.

Two-way communication helps promote a positive culture and environment at Harbor City. Our stakeholders receive timely information about all aspects of our school and are given opportunities to provide input. The following methods are used to inform and receive input: Blackboard Connects (phone calls, emails, and text messages), Harbor City Herald (our school newsletter), HCE Facebook page, flyers, and surveys.

Local community business and churches are critical stakeholders who help promote a positive culture and environment at Harbor City. Suntree United Methodist provided our students' families with a $35 Wal-Mart gift card to help them purchase school items. They also send volunteers to our school to help students academically. The Melbourne Square Mall provided our students with backpacks and school supplies. Domino's, McDonald's, and Jersey Mike's provide funding raising events for our school.

Our entire staff (teachers, administration, daycare workers, office staff, custodians, and bus drivers) are involved in the PBIS. They promote a positive culture and environment daily by implementing our schoolwide PBIS plan. They remind the students of the expectations throughout our campus and reward positive behavior. Teachers and administration work with the district MTSS personnel to help improve the behavior of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.