Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

50 HOLLAND CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Alison L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2020-21 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%)
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.](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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	28%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 that enable them to be successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
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 MTSS Monday Meetings, Leadership Team Meetings, and Data Team Meetings to lead the monitoring of student progress. She 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. She leads Data Team Meetings and collaborates routinely with the school counselor and literacy coach in this effort. 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 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 the MTSS Leadership Team and Data Team Meetings, and attends weekly leadership team meetings.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hodge, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Hodge is a teacher leader who provides professional development and guidance in the area of writing. She is the chair for the School-wide Writing Committee and collaboratively worked on establishing a school-wide program for writing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2016, 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.*

3

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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

444

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.

6

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	56	72	51	60	69	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	5	1	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	3	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	6	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Monday 9/13/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				71%	62%	57%	73%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	60%	58%	69%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	57%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				81%	63%	63%	77%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	65%	62%	77%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	53%	51%	70%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	57%	53%	66%	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	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	60%	25%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	91%	67%	24%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostics 1, 2 and 3 were utilized to progress monitor.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	77%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	75%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	33%	60%
	English Language Learners	75%	75%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	63%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	53%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	30%
	English Language Learners	75%	25%	50%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	69%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	54%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	44%	55%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	46%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	15%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	38%	45%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	54%	73%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	67%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	.07%	36%	64%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	23%	40%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	.06%	22%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	21%	57%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	81%	93%	97%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89%	89%	89%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	60%	80%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	36%	59%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	39%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	40%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	85%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	73%	82%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	67%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	63%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	36%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	67%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39%	54%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	35%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	28%	44%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	45%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	29%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	.06%	17%	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	50	58	46	50	75	73	29				
BLK	69			46							
HSP	81	85		81	100		40				
MUL	90			90							
WHT	78	77	56	79	88	76	53				
FRL	70	63		63	79		47				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	52	50	50	59	60	33				
BLK	50			42							
HSP	67	59		70	100						
MUL	88			94							
WHT	72	65	39	83	78	57	75				
FRL	50	51	47	67	68	54	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	58	50	40	57	54	40				
BLK	60	75		40	58						
HSP	65	47		72	86						
MUL	80	69		73	69						
WHT	76	72	55	81	78	73	77				
FRL	53	65	52	63	67	75	25				

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	73
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	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	77
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	90
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	72
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	64
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?

Holland showed significant growth in FSA results in 2021 compared to the results from 2019. An increase was noted in five out of the seven reporting categories, with the overall points increasing by 34 from 478 overall points in 2019 to 512 in 2021. This was the highest number of points Holland earned on FSA since its first administration in 2016. Our students scored above the state and district averages in all reporting categories except for science, which was above the state average but just slightly below the district average. From 2016 to 2019, our students with disabilities made slight progress, however, this subgroup was continually significantly lower in scoring at proficiency than their disabled counterparts. In 2021, this subgroup made a 17 percentage point increase going from 42% to 59%. While this is a noteworthy increase for this subgroup, it still remains an area of need.

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

Students with Disabilities scored at 52% proficiency, African American students at 46% proficiency, and our Economically Disadvantaged students are at 56% proficiency. Although these subgroups are not below the Federal Index threshold, we will still provide structured interventions and monitor these groups. Additionally, FSA scores show that on the writing portion of the ELA, the median score achieved by our 4th through 6th graders was a level 6 out of a possible 10. Additionally, students scoring at proficiency in science dropped significantly from 74% at proficiency in 2019, to 50% at proficiency in 2021.

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

COVID had a significant impact on student achievement, however, Holland was experiencing a downward trend in student achievement in the area of ELA before the pandemic. Science Fair projects were not required in 20-21 and there was a decrease in hands-on experimentation,

potentially contributing to the decline in science scores. In regard to the need for improvement in ELA, a contributing factor could be the excessive use of technology inhibiting students' language acquisition and direct contact with content/direct, live instruction. Hands-on science is occurring this year, along with the implementation of the new BEST ELA standards and ELA programs. Tier 2 and 3 interventions and the MTSS process continue to be perfected as well. The Holland School-Wide Writing Plan is being implemented in conjunction with these initiatives, in order to address the needs for improvement in ELA.

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

A 17 percentage point increase was noted in ELA for students in the bottom quartile making annual learning gains. While this was our highest growth category, we still plan to improve in this area as it at only 59% proficiency. Other areas showing improvement were:
- ELA Proficiency: Improved by 8 points from 71% in 2019 to 79% in 2021
- ELA Learning Gains in grades 5th and 6th: Improved by 13 points from 65% in 2019 to 78% in 2021
- Math Learning Gains in grades 5th and 6th: Improved by 7 points from 81% in 2019 to 88% in 2021
- Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile in grades 5th and 6th: Improved by 15 points from 64% in 2019 to 79% in 2021

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

Holland focused on the pervasive implementation and monitoring of the i-Ready instructional program. An incentive program was created and addressed the weekly usage and passing rates. Teachers conducted data chats with students after diagnostic testing and supported students in goal setting. Additionally, we continued and increased our use of data-driven instruction, along with a focus on self-assessed learners (students tracking their own progress). Teachers utilized grade level, rigorous materials for all students while supporting struggling students with scaffolding strategies. Holland made a concerted effort to reinforce the use of high-yield strategies, according to Hattie's research, to improve learning gains, along with pervasive implementation of the MTSS process.

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

Holland will be implementing Writing Across the Curriculum as the professional practice goal of our 2021-2022 School Improvement Plan. This strategy is researched based and has proven to increase students' critical thinking skills, helping prepare them for the expectations of the workforce. John Hattie's research states that scaffolding for all to have access to Tier 1 on grade-level instruction. An effect size higher than .4 is considered to be above average with writing having an effect size of .46. Holland's Schoolwide Writing Plan in conjunction with the writing expectations in the newly-adopted ELA programs will be the focus of professional development and our school improvement process in order to accelerate learning.

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.

In the spring of the 2020-2021 school year, Holland Elementary collaborated with ELA Content Specialist for Brevard Public Schools. She provided training for our fourth through sixth-grade teachers and students on Best Practices for Writing Instruction. The Content Specialist was instrumental in supporting the Writing Leadership Team in creating a cohesive school-wide writing plan with standardized practices across grade levels. Collaboratively, we built a guide for our faculty with a content-focused timeline, writing samples, rubrics, teacher resources, and BEST Standards. A primary goal was to create a systemic change in writing instruction that included the same terminology and practices across grade levels. The committee integrated the new reading series into

the school writing objective to create a cohesive plan. Teacher leaders have provided professional development during preplanning as well as during the first nine weeks of the 2021-2022 school year. The Writing Leadership Team along with the support of the District Content Specialist will continue to provide professional development in the area of writing instruction throughout the school year.

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

Routine Writing Leadership Team meetings will occur to plan for and carry out professional development opportunities to sustain the development of best instructional practices in writing. A SIP/ Professional Development Team has been created in order to plan and create check-points throughout the schoolyear in regard to school improvement action steps, goals, and progress monitoring. Holland will also implement the Academic Support Program to support our lowest 25% students with additional intervention. Our activity teachers will provide additional instruction for first and second grade students during the school day, in collaboration with classroom teachers to incorporate content skills into the activity classes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students in grades 4th through 6th participate in the writing portion to the FSA which combines with their reading score to provide students with an overall ELA outcome. When analyzing this data, it showed that the majority of students were scoring a 6 out of 10 on the writing section of FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 59% to 70% as evidenced by the FSA. ELA learning gains for all students will increase from 78% to 80% as evidenced by the FSA. 95% of students will meet annual typical growth gains as evidenced by the EOY i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment.
Monitoring:	Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on walk-through observational data. Data Team Meetings will ensure that all students' progress is reviewed and monitored. Additionally, Tier 2 and 3 intervention data will be reviewed to determine areas of concern in order to provide timely and specific feedback for all students. Various data will be reviewed during Data Team Meetings such as i-Ready, Benchmark Advance assessments, Standards Mastery, and FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Aloise (aloise.michelle@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing across the curriculum will be the main focus for our teachers to implement in the 2021-2022 school year. We will also continue with data-driven and standards-based instruction, and self-assessed learners (student data chats).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning to write, and write well, has a number of benefits. It is a crucial life skill that not only helps students to succeed in school, but it's also vital to success in the "real" world. Writing studies have shown that writing helps boost student achievement across the board because it actively engages children. Writing helps to reinforce the knowledge in the brain and activates neurons. Most importantly, we need to prepare our students for the future and they will be expected to write coherent, intelligent content once they enter the work force. Writing Programs have a .46 effect size strategy according to John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a Writing Leadership team that will formulate a school-wide writing plan and create a writing plan binder, that will include common planning, common terminology /language, and common process with the TEA chart for each teacher that will be utilized throughout the school year.

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

Collaborate with district content specialist to consult and provide professional development in writing in support of the school-wide writing plan.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Hodge (hodge.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Provide professional development in writing and integrate it through all content areas starting during pre-planning and continuing throughout the school year. This will be implemented with teacher leaders and the district content specialist.

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

Conduct weekly classroom walks focused on observing writing instruction.

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

Assess instruction and monitor progress to support current pedagogical practices and increase student achievement.

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

Expand classroom walk-throughs to include teacher leaders and potential peer learning walks.

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

Provide additional instruction during Media, Music, Art, and PE, through implementing standards/skills specific to content areas whenever possible.

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

Provide additional support to our lowest 25% of students, during the school day through the Academic Support Program.

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

Implement our school-wide writing plan with integration into the writing aspects of the Benchmark and SAVVAS programs.

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

Conduct mock writing assessments and scoring.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Hodge (hodge.jennifer@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.

Student suspensions for students with disabilities appear to be an area to monitor. As a school, we will continue our implementation of Conscious Discipline, Restorative Practices, and our "Bee the Change" Character Campaign. Our guidance counselor reviewed Behavior Intervention Plans with staff at the onset of the school and will update them as necessary. Behavioral concerns are discussed at Data Team Meetings to be as proactive as possible in planning Tier 2 and 3 behavioral interventions, setting students up for success. We will continue to review discipline data throughout the school year and track suspensions in and out of school.

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.

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 embark on year two training of Conscious Discipline in grades Kindergarten through Second Grades.

Holland's teachers responded to the annual Insight Survey given in the winter of 2020, 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 7.6, Learning Environment 6.5, and Academic Opportunity 6.0. Areas of opportunity are Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion 4.6, Instructional Planning for Student Growth 4.7 and Observation and Feedback 4.8.

The Brevard Parent Survey showed an overall customer satisfaction with Holland's faculty and staff, clean environment, and academics specifically with our gifted homerooms and iii instruction. The area identified as a growth opportunity was in consistency in communication.

Students at Holland Elementary were surveyed in January 2021 about their perceptions of their school. The highest-rated areas were Culture and Belonging. The areas with the greatest growth opportunities were Instructional Methods and Academic Challenge. Our Literacy and Writing Leadership Team is focusing on the instructional practices to include high-yield strategies according to Hattie's research and Writing Across the Curriculum.

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

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. Holland is in its second year of implementation and the Chair of the Restorative Practices Team Katie Manifold, provided a review of the important tenets of Restorative Practice and will provide additional support throughout the school year.

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 in 2020 to kindergarten through second-grade teachers with training throughout the 2020-2021 school year. The second year of implementation started during preplanning of 2021. There is a good level of understanding and implementation of Conscious Discipline at Holland.