Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

3011 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Educate and Inspire Students to SOAR! (revised 2022)

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will become upstanding and productive citizens. (revised 2022)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation 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 walkthroughs, conducts formal and informal observations, provides feedback and faciltates conversations with teachers to improve their practice.
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.
Pacarro, Laura	Reading 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.
Hoffman, Patricia	SAC Member	The SAC chair engages the school's stakeholders in the decision making process.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Parent, student, teacher/staff survey data and academic achievement data are shared with stakeholder groups and feedback is elicited in SAC meetings and faculty meetings. The data and feedback drive the development of SIP goals and their action steps.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP plan will be monitored throughout the year by looking at current data as new data points are made and tracking it against the goals within the SIP to make sure we are making growth toward the intended goals. We will meet in grade level data teams to discuss the overall data and then break it down into subgroups and by individual students to track growth. The plan will be revised as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	3	6	10	13	3	8	9	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	2	3	4	11	12	13	9	0	0	54
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	14	22	18	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	27	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	18	12	18	5	14	0	0	78

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	10

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	1	9	0	0	1	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	22	21	16	13	11	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	7	4	2	4	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	17	28	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	29	37	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	5	14	9	11	15	0	0	70

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	1	3	3	2	2	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	6

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	22	21	16	13	11	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	7	4	2	4	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	17	28	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	29	37	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	5	14	9	11	15	0	0	70

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	1	3	3	2	2	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	6

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52	58	53	51	61	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				57			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			49		
Math Achievement*	47	58	59	56	49	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				53			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			48		
Science Achievement*	48	58	54	35	60	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	54	59	41			50		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	259
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	4	
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	55			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	3	
HSP	50			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	52			47			48					57
SWD	30			26			38				4	
ELL	32			32							3	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			30			24				4	
HSP	58			54			58				5	60
MUL	50			45			36				4	
PAC												
WHT	57			53			62				4	
FRL	44			41			49				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	57	54	56	53	52	35					41
SWD	30	49	43	31	42	43	10					
ELL	25	58		25	50							41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	54	45	30	51	46	15					
HSP	51	58		60	55		38					36
MUL	53	62		65	71							
PAC												
WHT	58	58	63	63	50	46	42					
FRL	44	57	63	47	51	53	25					35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	49	49	42	46	48	37					50
SWD	26	31	29	20	29	29	30					30
ELL	53	36		47	45							50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	27	50	18	36	60	13					
HSP	56	44		40	38							44
MUL	40	32		35	41							
PAC												
WHT	60	63	60	51	53	48	51					
FRL	41	46	48	35	40	38	30					40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	58%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	41%	61%	-20%	47%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	67%	-14%	54%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	61%	-21%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	51%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

4th grade math was the lowest data component at 40%. 4th grade ELA is also concerning at 49%. 5th grade science is at 45%. Low student engagement within the math lessons may be a contributing factor to the low math scores as this was a low data point in the student survey. 6th grade ELA overall proficiency was also low (40%).

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

Overall math proficiency dropped from last year. It dropped from 56% overall to 49% overall. Not completing the identified gap lessons the year prior may have contributed to the decline as the students had not been exposed to the prerequisite skills needed to build on for the following year with new math standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

4th grade math (39%) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (60%) . One third of the grade level was considerably lower. The size of the classes could have contributed to the lower scores as the teachers could not easily meet with students on an individual level.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

5th grade science improved from last year's score of 35% to this year's score of 45%. We increased the amount of Academic Support Classes in science that we had comparative to the year prior.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The Federal Index of 39% with our black students has been below 41% for 3 years. Similarly, our Students with Disabilities have been below 41% (35%) for 3 years.

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

1. Overall math proficiency
2. Subgroup achievement in ELA (Black, ELL, and SWD)
3. Subgroup achievement in Math (Black, ELL, and SWD)
4. Science Achievement

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our students with Disabilities (35%), Black/African Americans (39%), and ELL (40%) are below the Federal Index of 41% . Black/African American students have been a subgroup that is struggling for 3 years now, along with our Students with Disabilities. Support is needed for these subgroups of students so that they don't slip farther behind and decrease in proficiency.

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

The goal for 2023-2024 is to have a Federal Index of over 41% to show that these students' academic needs are being addressed.

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

To monitor our subrgoups we will specifically discuss student progress of our students ensuring that they are receiving the level of support they need, that they are in the correct level of intervention support, encouraging them to attend Academic Support Program classes, and opening lines of communication between school and home.

Student progress will be monitored by tracking FAST PM1 and PM2 data, iReady D1 and D2 data, district science assessments, district math assessments, and OPM data from intervention groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Response to Intervention- Ensuring that our subgroups of students are being served in intervention groups.
2. Teachers will participate and engage in professional development on Differentiated Instruction and Scaffolding instruction.
3. Academic Support will be offered after school to provide additional support for students. A concerted effort will be made to reach out to these parents to improve attendance in the program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Response to intervention targets students' skill deficients and provides instruction based on specific skills that the students are lacking. By targeting the foundational skills a student is missing they are closing gaps so they can better access accelerated learning.
2. By providing differentiated instruction and scaffolding instruction student growth and proficiency will increase.
3. Afterschool Academic Support will extend learning opportunities to meet the needs of our students and provide extra instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Review the Elementary Tiered Decisions Trees in the BPS K-12 Reading Plan and Tier 1 data to determine who qualifies for intervention services. Use diagnostic data to determine which skills are needed by each student.
2. Provide interventions and progress monitor as required.
3. Data team meetings will determine student movement through the intervention groups as their skills increase in proficiency.

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

By When: May 2024

1. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers to engage in learning around differentiated instruction and scaffolding to support learning.
2. Create a look-for tool to identify scaffolding strategies and differentiating strategies to use during walk throughs.
3. Monitor and provide feedback in the differentiation of learning and the use of scaffolding strategies.

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

By When: May 2024

1. Use diagnostic data, progress monitoring data, and teacher input to ensure our students in the at risk subgroups are offered afterschool academic support.
2. Follow up with parents in our subgroups who do not initially attend to encourage attendance.
3. Provide quality resources for instruction during academic support classes.

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

By When: May 2024

1. Adjust the master schedule so that our Students with Disabilities are supported in the general education classroom so they have access to grade level materials and lessons with their same age peers.
2. Provide Imagine Learning and Learning Ally to our ELL students attending before school tutoring sessions.
3. Have an ESOL Parent night to explain Imagine Learning and Learning Ally. Offer tips on how they can use these programs and more to support their child's learning from home.

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

By When: August 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Discipline was a major concern in our survey feedback from students and teachers. Both teachers and students recognized that some behaviors took away from learning opportunities for all students in the class. The lowest area on the teacher survey was the Learning Environment. Teacher Insight survey results show a decrease in appropriate behavior and academic motivation as students get older. This reflects a relationship between inconsistent expecations and consequences as students' age increases. The lowest area on the student survey was Academic Challenge and Instructional Methods. An increase in behaviors could occur when the students don't feel challenged by the work and if the students don't feel supported academically by their teacher.

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

To measure improvement in the area of positive culture and environment we will want to see the Learnng Environment domain on the teacher survey increase by 25% to 3.3.The current score is 2.7. The Brevard average is 4.9. On the student survey the goal is to increase the Academic Challenge measure from the 3rd percentile to at least the 25th percentile.

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

The PBIS team will monitor discipline data by looking at the number of referrals and the details regarding the referrals, such as when the behaviors take place, where the behaviors take place, and what behaviors are being noted. The PBIS team will share this data with the teachers and elicit feedback on ways to improve for those areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Tracy (tracy.william@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Program will be continued at Andersen for the 23-24 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing the PBIS framework, our school will support students' academic and behavioral successes. Using PBIS strategies will improve the learning environment by reducing disciplinary incidents, improving students outcomes, and increasing the students' perceptions of feeling connected to and supported by the school adults.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

1. Provide teachers with professional development in regards to engagement strategies to increase active engagment in the classroom.
2. Teachers to review SOAR expectations with the students on a regular basis so all students have a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations.
3. Regularly review referral data to determine where more specific instruction in behaviorial expecations is needed.
4. Reinforce positive student behavior by giving Eagle Bucks to students exhibiting SOAR expectations.
5. Allowing students regular opportunities to redeem Eagle Bucks earned.
6. Celebrate student and class successes by recognizing students of the week, exemplary behavior in the cafeteria, and Eagle Awards at award ceremonies.

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

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science proficiency 3+ on 22-23 FSA = 45%. This is an increase of 10 percentage points from the previous year, but still continues to be below the district averages.
Math proficiency 3+ on 22-23 FSA = 49%. This is an decrease from 56% last year.

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 45% to 55%.
Math proficiency will increase from 49% to 55%

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

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

Math Monoring: Quarterly math assessments and district summative science assessments will be monitored. Penda use will be tracked with increased incentives as students pass lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The BSCS 5E instructional Model for Science
Reveal Math
Observation and Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Science: 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.

Math: Reveal Math, used for core instruction, meets the recommendations for ESSA evidence Tier 4. (from reveal math website) Evidence-based strategies embedded in this curriculum include metacognition, sense-making, use of manipulatives/visual representations, development of problem solving skills, classroom discourse, productive struggle, fluency and clear instructional routines.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Science:
1. A recognition program will be used to encourage students to use PENDA Science and pass their lesson quizzes on the earlier attempts.
2. The district science resource teacher will provide professional development on teaching vocabulary strategies to the students and increasing engagement within the lesson.
3. Teachers will plan together to provide for more authentic hands-on engagement activities.
4. Teachers will focus on the Elaborate phase of the 5E model during the planning stages of their lessons.
5.Use online summative assessments as a data source for progress monitoring.

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

By When: May 2024

Math
1. The district math coach will meet with teachers to plan their instruction focusing on the Launch and Explore and Develop portions of the lessons to increase student engagement.
2. Teachers will use district provided pacing guides to ensure all BEST Benchmarks are being taught.
3. The teachers will use exit tickets after each lesson and meet with students as needed to reteach and provide differentiated instruction based on their needs at that time.
4. Walk throughs that focus on student engagement will be conducted by the administration and math coach on a regular basis.
5.Monitor student progress by examining data from FAST PM1 & PM2, iReady D1 & D2, and District Math Quarterly Assessments.

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

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

After looking at data from the 2023 F.A.S.T., the leadership team worked to allocate staff members to support the areas most in need. An Instructional Assistant was hired this year to support kindergarten and first grade teachers with Tier 1 literacy support. This Instructional Assistant will work with the teachers to provide differentiated instruction to students in kindergarten and first grade.

For Tier 2 & Tier 3 support, extra staff support will be scheduled for this year's 2nd graders because of their low proficiency rates from STAR Reading assessment.

The master schedule was adjusted to add a Magnetic Reading block for grades K-2 and math intervention time for all grade levels. The reading intervention block was scheduled on a school-wide basis for first thing in the morning to allow non-classroom instructional staff to assist with interventions.

District personnel including the math coach, literacy coach, and science resource teacher are scheduled to conduct walk throughs with administration and provide feedback to improve instructional practices and support teacher instruction in the classroom.

Learning Ally is a program provided for our Students with Disabilities, ELL students, and all students receiving

T2 and T3 intervention supports. The Learning Ally App is an online library of audio books, and should already be on students' Launchpad account. Students can search and add books to a bookshelf and use the program during independent reading time or at home.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

60% of the 1st graders scored below proficiency on the Star Reading Assessment. This is one of the grade levels identified in RAISE status. This data show a need for more support for this year's 2nd graders. More intervention resources will be funneled to 2nd grade to support T2 and T3 instruction. Walk throughs will focus on T1 instruction to ensure that program fidelity is being achieved and students are engaged and doing the thinking.

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

44% of students in grade 3, 46% of grade 4, and 41% of grade 5 scored below a level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

55% of students in grades K-2 will meet proficiency (70th percentile on STAR).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% of students in grades 3-6 will score a level 3 or above on the FAST.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Data teams will meet regularly to discuss progress monitoring data from data sources including FAST PM1 and PM2, iready D1 and D2, ELA district assessments, and intervention data. Changes in instruction will be made based on data collected. As a result of this progress monitoring, students will increase in proficiency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harris, Kimberly, harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

Tier 1 students will use
1. Benchmark Advance
2. Magnetic Reading (K-2) and iReady differentiated instruction resources
3. Students will be monitored with classroom walk throughs, grade level planning, and data analysis in grade level data meetings.
T2 /T3 students will use:
1. 95% Group Phonics Lesson Library
2. Read Naturally
3. 95% Group Vocabulary and Comprehension Intervention programs
4. Visualizing and Verbalizing Comprehension Intervention
5. FCRR resources
T2 and T3 interventions will be monitored with walk throughs and MTSS data meetings.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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:
o B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
o Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
o Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
o Systematic and/or Explicit
o 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
Literacy Leadership: 1. Establish a Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) made up of the literacy coach, administration, and grade level representatives. 2. Meet with LLT monthly to assess the needs of the school and determine immediate needs of the teachers. 3. Conduct collaborative planning sessions, facilitated by literacy coach to plan standards-aligned lessons. 4. Conduct walk throughs with the LLT to discover trends and PD needs as a school.	Pacarro, Laura, pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org
Literacy Coaching: 1. Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations, and engaging in data chats 2. Prepare for planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work 3. During planning, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning. 4. Identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.) 5. Implement coaching cyles as needed to increase teacher efficacy and effectiveness.	Pacarro, Laura, pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org
Assessment: 1. Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. 2. 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. 3. Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM. 4. Daily exit tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed.	Tracy, William, tracy.william@brevardschools.org
Professional Learning: 1. Intervention material and instruction PD will be provided by Literacy Coach and/or Leadership Team 2. Establish a walk through rotation that includes teachers visiting other classrooms, identifying trends, and action steps to improve instructional practices. 3. Ensure that time is provided for teachers to meet weekly for professional development/planning. 4. Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions. 5. Continue professional learning from last year focusing on explicit instruction, systematic instruction, scaffolding instruction, corrective feedback, and differentiated instruction. 6. Use the School Leaders Literacy Walk Through Tool from the FLDOE to conduct walk throughs and identify feedback to give to teachers.	Harris, Kimberly, harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org