

Brevard Public Schools

Harbor City Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/1/2014

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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	ATSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	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.

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

(revisited 2021)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students who rise above;
Teachers who go beyond!

(revisited 2021)

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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	Reading Coach	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. He is funded by Title I.
Tingle, Matt	Instructional Coach	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. He is funded by Title I.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/1/2014, Christine Boyd E

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

398

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	64	52	58	48	45	57	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	368	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	15	12	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	7	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	61%	56%				58%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						55%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						44%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	58%	49%	50%				62%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						57%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						52%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	60%	59%				56%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	24	52	63	33	56	62					
ELL	36			50							
BLK	37	50	45	38	57	60	27				
HSP	57	69		52	56						
MUL	25			42							
WHT	63	68		67	56	30	40				
FRL	51	63	65	53	56	57	38				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA showed HCE: 55% District 58% level 3 and higher.

Scoring Level 3 and above on the ELA portion of the test Multiracial 25%, SWD 24% and ELL 36%.

We scored 38% on the Science test.

We administered the i-Ready Diagnostic 3 in grades K-2; K 74%, 1st 65.8%, and 2nd 80.8%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The subgroups that need the greatest improvement are: Multiracial 25%, SWD 24%, And ELL 36%.

Science - 38%, district average 55%, state average 48%

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 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 Intervention. All students are assigned small working groups 30 minutes four times a week based on their individual i-Ready diagnostic.

The students who are two or more grade levels below are expected to complete five lessons of ELA in i-Ready 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.

Science was not taught with hands on learning. We will need to monitor this at all levels, we will add Professional development from the District resource teacher, the Starbase Program in fifth grade, PENDA for grades 3-6, and teachers will write a plan to improve, and we will observe and give feedback.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Improvements:

-Our most improved - ELA L25% (The Learning Gains among the lowest 25% in ELA were 17 percentage points higher than the District Average).

-To support our Lowest 25% of learnings in ELA, provide added support for all students through daily Walk to Intervention.

- 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, and Math Lowest 25%.

On the FSA Math assessment our African American students 67% had a 23-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 8 percentage point increase is evidence that the increased focus on 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. 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 grade level data chats and 90 minute planning for teachers with the support of Title 1 and the Literacy Coach.
3. Monitor Level 4 and 5 students to maintain and increase status. - Targeted Walk to Intervention instruction to accelerate learning in ELA .

4. Walkthroughs with feedback
5. Benchmark Advance Assessments
6. Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

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 and Savvas ELA training and support from the Literacy Coach was provided during pre-planning and will continue throughout the school year to support Tier I instruction. The Literacy Coach will support classroom teachers through modeling and providing feedback and strategies to enhance student learning in ELA.

The Vision for Excellence will be addressed continually with the faculty to support all instruction.

The new math programs Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (6) provided by the district will be our core instruction and professional development will be offered as needed.

In Science we will be monitoring that all classes teach and explore science with a hands-on approach to learning. We will use the District Science Resource teacher to come to our school for professional development.

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. Implement the new math programs with fidelity to scaffold the skills to be successful in the new programs.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>During our Comprehensive Needs Assessment Team Meeting, we reviewed and discussed the following data: i-Ready K-6, FSA scores, subgroup data, RAISE status, and surveys (parent, student, and staff), attendance rate, discipline data, and school grade.</p> <p>Harbor City is currently a "B" school, our goal is an "A" school where 70% of all learners are at 3 and above! ELA 55%; Mathematics is 58% and Science is at 38%. The gaps between where we are and where we plan to be at the end of the year; scores will increase by the following amounts ELA 14% Math 12% and Science 32%. We believe that by raising these scores the gaps in our subgroups will improve as a result of all students being more successful.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>For the 2023 school year Harbor City will have 70% of all students at 3 or above in all areas tested!</p> <p>Baseline was 21-22 58%, which means we need a 12% increase.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>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 teachers for 40 minutes three times a week to work on extra math strategies to strengthen attitude and performance.</p> <p>We will also use Title I dollars for translators(T) to help out ELL students. This will help them in language development and support math efforts.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>--Teachers will meet in data chats bi-weekly to plan collaboratively the math lessons and practice to align with core curriculum.</p> <p>--Teachers will have an extra 90 minute planning biweekly with math coach with specific emphasis on subgroup strategies for success and progress.</p> <p>--Math Party - a strategy for our lowest 25% students, in small groups, by grade level, to work with a teacher and an 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 weekly required lessons.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	<p>--We are using Title I dollars to purchase an on-line program Reflex (T) in third grade to help with math facts. Additionally, Reflex will be used with our students who scored Level 1 on FSA mathematics in grades 4-6.</p> <p>--Our Title I Teacher (T) and assistants (T) will work directly with groups of students in Walk to Intervention small groups to improve skills.</p>

**resources/criteria
used for selecting
this strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

--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 Title I Teacher (T) will use 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.

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

--We will conduct Professional Development (T) as part of our training on the B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA and the new B.E.S.T. Standards for Math along with our results from the annual comprehensive assessment tools.

--Our bi-weekly data chats will review data with teachers of i-Ready Math and i-Ready Reading at all grade levels to measure student progress. 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;

-- All students are assigned small working groups for 30 minutes daily based on their individual i-Ready Diagnostic.

--A tri-annual review of student data from formal assessments.

--Need a typing course as the test should be about the learning and not typing (T).

--Purchase additional computers to support students' needs related to iReady, Reflex, Lexia, and FAST (T).

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

--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).

--Leadership Team along with grade level teams will conduct monthly walkthroughs focused on the Brevard Vision for Excellence Instruction and provide feedback to teachers.

--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 Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

During our Comprehensive Needs Assessment Team Meeting, during this meeting we reviewed and discussed the following data: i-Ready K-6, FSA scores, subgroup data, RAISE status, and surveys (parent, student, and staff) Attendance rate, discipline data, and school grade.

Harbor City is currently a "B" school, our goal is an "A" school where 70% of all learners are at 3 and above! ELA 55%; Mathematics is 58% and Science is at 38%. The gaps between where we are and where we plan to be at the end of the year; scores will increase by the following amounts ELA 14% Math 12% and Science 32%. We believe that by raising these scores the gaps in our subgroups will improve as a result of all students being more successful.

Science was a noted area of concern 21-22 38% State average 55% district average 48%

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.
This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Science proficiency will increase from 38% (21-22) to 70%. This will mean an increase of 32%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will be looking for more hands-on science in grades 3-6. PENDA monitoring on a biweekly basis to find areas of concern so we can reteach. We will also observe, give feedback and observe again. We will add STARBASE to our 5th grade curriculum. Monitor the action plans written by teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Salamone (salamone.joy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

PENDA is a strategy based on-line program to help teachers find the gaps in learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We believe that PENDA helps students learn the content of science and identify gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

--PENDA

--add the district mentor teacher to our plan M. Ferro will be invited to our school

--monitor individual plans

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

StarBase program for 5th graders will be used for career readiness and to deliver hands-on science for instruction.

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

District content specialist (M. Ferro) will be used for professional development. -M. Ferro will support teacher planning

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

Teachers will use the non-fiction reading strategies to improve the comprehension of science text e.g. Text. features..

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

- D3 i-Ready data from 21-22 shows that 22% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment.
- Data chats need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

- 21-22 FSA Data shows 45% of 3rd Graders, 49% of 4th Graders and 54% of 5th Graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2)
- Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in Grades 3-5.
- Data chats need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short Term - From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 15%. The D3 data showed that 22% of our students were not on track.

Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 25%

Add baseline data.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short Term - From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 15%.

Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 25%.

Add baseline data.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

- PM 1, PM 2, FAST
- i-Ready D1 and D2
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Benchmark Advance Assessments
- Intervention Data
- Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Salamone, Joy, salamone.joy@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Lexia

Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards

Science of Reading domains include PA, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension

i-Ready

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as they are:

- B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
- Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or Explicit
- Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

Action Step: Content Coach will facilitate benchmark-aligned planning.

- Literacy Coaching:

- Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations, and engaging in data chats.
 - Prepare for planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.
 - During planning, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.
- Rolling Readers grades K-3 (T)

Brown, Audra,
brown.audra@brevardschools.org

Professional Learning

- Literacy Coach will provide job-embedded PD and side by side coaching.
- Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions.

- Assessment

- Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development.
- Define performance criteria based on assessment data that prompts the addition of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for students not meeting expectations/benchmarks.
- Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and Intervention OPM.

SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION

Salamone, Joy,
salamone.joy@brevardschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 that are more proximal to the school include teachers, students, 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!

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school

(89% yes), effectiveness of school's information being sent online (94% received online) and information being

sent from the Principal. Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent/teacher communication, and more

resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS

& Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Weekly parent academic

resources will be sent with the Principal's newsletter to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with standards.

- Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for BPS in the following

categories: Academic engagement, academic rigor and relationships. These focus areas will be addressed with

the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising

the level of rigor in daily instruction. Monthly department meetings will include specific action analysis of

these

standards and ensure that items are being addressed. Additionally, student leaders will meet with school administration each semester to gain further insight into which practices are most effective as viewed by the students.

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

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 Digest (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 \$50 Wal-Mart gift card to help them purchase school items. They also send volunteers along with Westshore Jr. Sr. High School to our school to help students academically. Multiple businesses in our area have provided our students with backpacks and school supplies. River Run Christian Church is providing selected families with weekend food bags. Domino's, McDonald's, Texas Roadhouse, Kona Ice 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.