

Brevard Public Schools

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

3011 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.andersen.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Harris T

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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: C (48%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

3011 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.andersen.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	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

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.

Meaningfully educate, inspire and support students to successfully SOAR in the community through active engagement. (revised 2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will become lifelong learners and positive members of society. (revised 2019)

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
Harris, Kimberly	Principal	As Andersen's primary instructional leader, the principal plans and coordinates professional development, conducts classroom walk throughs, conducts formal and informal observations, provides feedback and facilitates conversations with teachers about their practice.
Hoffman, Patricia	SAC Member	The SAC chair engages the school's stakeholders in the decision making process.
Pacarro, Laura	Instructional Coach	As a teacher leader, the instructional coach walks hand in hand with the teachers. She conducts professional development to enhance the teachers' understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards, provides grade level and one-on-one coaching to teachers, and leads data chats during the MTSS process.
Tracy, William	Assistant Principal	Also an instructional leader at Andersen, the assistant principal conducts walk throughs, informal and formal observations, feedback sessions with teachers, acts as the PBIS chairperson, monitors discipline, and conducts professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kimberly Harris T

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

589

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

4

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

2

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	77	78	90	84	84	88	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	24	22	14	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	12	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	25	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	3	2	0	0	14	27	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	7	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/16/2021

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	83	88	71	89	90	80	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	9	15	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

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	5	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	83	88	71	89	90	80	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	9	15	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

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	5	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				59%	62%	57%	59%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	60%	58%	49%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	57%	53%	35%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	62%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	65%	62%	54%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	53%	51%	50%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	57%	53%	74%	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	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2021					
	2019	61%	60%	1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2021					
	2019	56%	67%	-11%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

20-21 iReady data

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/55%	67/66%	71/86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/53%	30/50%	31/84%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	4/25%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	4/50%	4/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65/43%	66/56%	71/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/31%	29/48%	31/52%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	3/33%	4/50%
	English Language Learners	4/25%	4/0%	4/25%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/22%	82/35%	85/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/20%	60/33%	63/48%
	Students With Disabilities	23/4%	23/13%	24/29%
	English Language Learners	6/0%	6/17%	6/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81/23%	82/35%	85/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/20%	60/33%	63/43%
	Students With Disabilities	23/13%	23/22%	24/29%
	English Language Learners	6/0%	6/0%	6/17%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/35%	70/43%	75/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/31%	50/38%	53/57%
	Students With Disabilities	17/18%	17/29%	18/33%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/20%	59/28%	75/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/21%	49/22%	53/38%
	Students With Disabilities	17/24%	16/19%	18/44%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74/53%	75/75%	79/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/46%	42/71%	44/80%
	Students With Disabilities	12/25%	12/58%	12/75%
	English Language Learners	4/0%	4/50%	6/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74/5%	76/32%	79/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/2%	43/21%	44/50%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0%	12/25%	12/50%
	English Language Learners	4/0%	4/0%	6/0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/29%	80/43%	81/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/22%	46/30%	46/41%
	Students With Disabilities	22/5%	23/13%	23/26%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/12%	76/24%	79/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/13%	43/16%	45/27%
	Students With Disabilities	22/0%	22/0%	22/14%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73/34%	74/41%	75/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/27%	47/36%	46/43%
	Students With Disabilities	18/17%	18/22%	18/28%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/25%	74/24%	76/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/18%	47/21%	47/45%
	Students With Disabilities	18/17%	18/22%	18/28%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/33%

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	26	31	29	20	29	29	30				
ELL	53	36		47	45						
BLK	17	27	50	18	36	60	13				
HSP	56	44		40	38						
MUL	40	32		35	41						
WHT	60	63	60	51	53	48	51				
FRL	41	46	48	35	40	38	30				
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	32	33	28	33	32	25	10				
ELL	46	75		46	33						
BLK	39	36	32	48	47	41	12				
HSP	62	62		56	41						
MUL	65	46		58	38						
WHT	63	55	51	61	46	28	54				
FRL	52	50	43	49	42	25	37				
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	23	29	24	19	34	36	50				
BLK	33	43	33	40	30	25	67				
HSP	63	42		78	72		100				
MUL	56	50		65	46						
WHT	64	52	44	64	57	59	71				
FRL	51	43	24	54	46	45	69				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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	32
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

ESE students and Black/African Americans are the subgroups that have the biggest gap in proficiency. This is evident in progress monitoring and 2021 assessments in both reading and math. Also the overall math average (50%) is significantly lower than the reading average (64%) and below district averages in every grade level.

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

Math is consistently lower than reading; particularly in grades 4 and 6.

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

We believe a lack of a common language and common strategies across grade levels is a contributing factor. We have three different math programs between grades K-6. To avoid confusion moving from one grade level to the next the teachers will need to be using common strategies across all grade levels.

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

Overall learning gains stayed very steady compared to 2019 data. Learning gains of the lowest 25% increased in reading 4% points and 20% in math.

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

Teachers identifying the lowest 25% in reading and math, ensuring these students are in intervention groups, and having students complete exit slips in math along with reteaching most likely played a factor in this improvement.

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

In math, teachers will provide all students with grade level work while providing supports, scaffolding and lessons for prerequisite skills so students are ready for the new learning. In ELA, teachers will provide grade level lessons while supporting students in small groups with scaffolding and just in time supports to allow them access to grade level curriculum.

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.

Teachers and administration will be trained in using iReady to analyze data, identify students in need of prerequisite skills prior to new learning , and using iReady Toolbox lessons for those identified students. In ELA, teachers will ensure small group instruction during tier 1 instruction is targeting specific skills based on needs of the students.

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

Teachers and administration will plan lessons for specific math standards, administer a common assessment, and analyze the data from that assessment to determine next steps. In ELA, regular walk-throughs from administration and the literacy coach and feedback sessions with the teachers will ensure fidelity in teaching and improve practice.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Due to Covid effects and a continual decline in ELA overall proficiency levels the last couple years the ELA proficiency scores are very low across the grade levels. Data shows that scores dropped 10 percentage points from 59% to 49% in ELA proficiency. Last years SIP focus was identifying students in need of supports through the MTSS process. This allowed our learning gains overall and Learning gains of the lowest 25% to stay steady or increase. The focus now needs to be on Tier 1 ELA instruction while continuing to identify and serve struggling students through the MTSS process.

Measurable Outcome:

The goals are to:

1. Increase ELA achievement from 49% to 65%.
2. Increase ELA learning gains from 49% to 65%

Monitoring:

iReady ELA diagnostic data will be used to monitor growth towards desired outcome. Student data will be progress monitored three times a year; Fall, Winter, and Spring. Benchmark and Savvas unit tests will be used for additional progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption list.

Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) ©2022, Florida Edition
myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6, ©2022, 1st Edition

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

49% of students at Andersen Elementary are proficient in ELA based on 21 FSA ELA Achievement data. Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. High-quality reading instruction requires that teachers understand more than simply what to teach. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction to meet individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate collaborative planning with grade level teams to support Tier 1 standards-aligned instruction using the Unit Lesson Plans focusing on the standard(s) being taught, the assessment to assess mastery, and student tasks that are to the depth of the standard.

Person Responsible

Laura Pacarro (pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org)

Students will take two Standards Mastery Assessments each nine weeks.

Person Responsible

Laura Pacarro (pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org)

Teachers and Literacy Coach will analyze iReady data to drive instruction, motivate, and set goals with students.

Person Responsible

Laura Pacarro (pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org)

Principal ,AP, and literacy coach will provide consistent observations based on targeted look-fors, provide actionable feedback, and monitor the change in practice. School administrators and/or coaches will continue to observe and provide feedback as new practices emerge.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Administration and Literacy Coach will provide PD and support for the implementation of the new ELA curriculum and B.E.S.T. standards through monthly grade level meetings and monthly ELA support meetings. This will build teacher capacity and help to improve Core Instructional practices.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Identify and monitor students during walk throughs in the following subgroups: Lowest 25%, SWD, multi-racial students, Black/African American students, and FRL students to ensure that all students given opportunities for active engagement and peer discussion.

Person Responsible William Tracy (tracy.william@brevardschools.org)

Literacy Coach and Administration will support teachers when planning for differentiated Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible Laura Pacarro (pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org)

Accelerate learning by providing PD to teachers regarding explicit vocabulary instruction by means of previewing vocabulary and completing advance organizers prior to interacting with complex texts. Monitor use of these strategies during walk throughs.

Person Responsible Laura Pacarro (pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math proficiency levels have decreased over the last several years. Due to Covid effects and an inconsistent math curriculum we are now at 42% of our students at proficiency. Last year's focus on subgroups and reteaching increased learning gains of the lowest 25% from 25% to 48%. This year the focus needs to be on Tier 1 math instruction to increase the number of students obtaining proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: The goals are to:
 1. Increase Math achievement from 42% to 65%.
 2. Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 46% to 65%.
 3. Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making learning gains from 48% to 65%.

Monitoring: iReady Math diagnostic data will be used to monitor growth towards desired outcome. Student data will be progress monitored three times a year; Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Analysis of iReady diagnostic data
 Standards-aligned instruction
 Differentiated small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group differentiated instruction will target those students who need just-in time supports as they engage in grade level curriculum and reteaching based on exit slips will provide targeted instruction based on what students need.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will set the intention for learning by discussing the expectation of the standard posted on their focus boards.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Administration will initiate an observation and feedback schedule with specific areas of focus each week that drives core instruction.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

The master schedule will include 10-15 minutes at the beginning of each block to reteach the skill from the previous day to those students whose exit slips showed a deficiency or provide the necessary prerequisite skills needed for students to be ready for the days learning.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use diagnostic data to determine who needs prerequisite lessons to be ready for their learning.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will provide exit slips at the conclusion of each lesson to determine level of proficiency of the focus standard(s) and follow up with a reteaching lesson for identified students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will receive professional development from an iReady consultant on using data to determine prerequisite lessons needed for students to be ready for the grade level learning.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will identify and monitor iReady diagnostic data with an emphasis on the lowest 25%, SWD, Black/African American, FRL, and multi-racial subgroups and track their growth with the goal that the students reach for their stretch growth.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Science proficiency 3+ on 20-21 assessment = 37% (2 year trend)

Measurable Outcome: 53/89 students = 60% 3+ proficiency Goal: 37% to 60%

Monitoring: Walk throughs and feedback from administrators focused on the Elaborate phase of the 5E model and the hands on authentic engagement that the students have with the lesson material.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The BSCS 5E instructional model for science
Observation and Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The 5E instructional model allows for the students to partake in authentic Engagement, Exploration and Explanation of a topic. The students put their learning into action during the Elaboration portions of the lesson and then finally are Evaluated on their learning. Going through this instructional model will allow the students to use the "activity before concept" approach to learning about a topic and diving into the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will plan for and provide for more authentic hands-on engagement activities.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will focus on the Elaborate phase of the 5E model during the planning stages of their lessons.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Walk throughs and collaborative planning sessions with a team that may include the district science resource teacher, administration, and/or director scheduled once per quarter.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Use Penda Science in grades 3-6 for interactive science instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Use online summative assessments as a data source for progress monitoring.

Person Responsible William Tracy (tracy.william@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Our incidences per 100 students is less than the statewide average, however we have an elevated rate of in-school and out of school suspensions in the year 2019/20. We implemented SEL strategies-Conscious Discipline Tier 1 school-wide and SEL Tier 2 groups per grade level- to create a more inclusive school culture by teaching coping strategies, problem solving skills, and emotional regulation to students. Ongoing Conscious Discipline training will support teacher capacity to handle the behaviors in an effective manner to keep students in the classroom.

The PBIS and SEL teams will monitor school discipline data, share data with faculty, and implement Tier 2 strategies as necessary for students. There will be a school-wide Conscious Discipline focus for the week that teachers will support during their daily meeting time, through connected videos, and shown on the TV announcements daily.

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.

Students, Teachers, and community stakeholders were encouraged to participate in surveys of school culture; Insight Survey and Youth Truth Survey. These surveys allowed the stakeholders to voice their opinion in the areas that we are doing well in and areas that could be improved. The results have been shared with stakeholders and decisions made based on the input received. We will continue to implement Tier 1 PBIS and SEL strategies and get training to implement Tier 2 strategies. We will add quarterly recognition ceremonies to celebrate our students' successes and invite parents in for the ceremonies. Conscious Discipline training will continue this year during monthly sessions with the practices implemented to build teacher capacity and provide students the supports to be successful in the classrooms. We have a method for teachers to celebrate teachers through shout outs read at faculty meetings and our PTO membership has increased this year.

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

Mr. Tracy, the assistant principal is the PBIS chairperson and business partner coordinator. Mrs. Harris, the school principal, schedules and implement professional development and daily support for teachers in the classrooms and updates social media platforms.

Mrs. Campbell, our school counselor and SEL Team Lead , attends PBIS trainings and works closely with teachers and students to provide Tier 2 behavioral and SEL supports.

Our PBIS Team consists of multiple grade level representatives who all meet monthly to plan student celebrations and PBIS implementation.

Students and Parents of Andersen Elementary are key stakeholders in the school. Students are on the Youth Leadership Team and safety patrol. Parents complete surveys, attend and participate on our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).