

Brevard Public Schools

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

3011 S FISKE BLVD, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Harris T

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
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: C (51%) 2020-21: (46%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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	TS&I

* 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.

Part 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

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
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 facilitates conversations with teachers to improve their practice.
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.
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.
Hoffman, Patricia	SAC Member	The SAC chair engages the school's stakeholders in the decision making process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kimberly Harris T

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

587

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

5

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

3

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	0	85	82	91	83	89	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	22	21	16	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	7	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	0	14	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	16	5	14	9	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	4	1	3	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	4	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/28/2022

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	77	78	90	84	84	88	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	24	22	14	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	12	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	25	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	2	0	0	14	27	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	77	78	90	84	84	88	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	24	22	14	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	12	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	25	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	2	0	0	14	27	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	51%	61%	56%	49%			59%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	63%	61%	49%			53%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	52%	49%			45%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	60%	60%	42%			59%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%	64%	64%	46%			46%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	55%	55%	48%			28%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	56%	51%	37%			47%	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	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2022					
	2019	61%	60%	1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2022					
	2019	56%	67%	-11%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

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	30	49	43	31	42	43	10				
ELL	25	58		25	50						
BLK	33	54	45	30	51	46	15				
HSP	51	58		60	55		38				
MUL	53	62		65	71						
WHT	58	58	63	63	50	46	42				
FRL	44	57	63	47	51	53	25				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	31	29	20	29	29	30				
ELL	53	36		47	45						
BLK	17	27	50	18	36	60	13				
HSP	56	44		40	38						
MUL	40	32		35	41						
WHT	60	63	60	51	53	48	51				
FRL	41	46	48	35	40	38	30				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	33	28	33	32	25	10				
ELL	46	75		46	33						
BLK	39	36	32	48	47	41	12				
HSP	62	62		56	41						
MUL	65	46		58	38						
WHT	63	55	51	61	46	28	54				
FRL	52	50	43	49	42	25	37				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	63

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	47
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?

5th grade is the lowest across reading and math of the grade levels. Sub groups SWD and BIK/AA all increased in reading and math achievement. The subgroup that declined was ELL students in ELA achievement. Math was higher than reading in all grade levels, except 4th grade.

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

ELL student achievement in reading (25%) is the subgroup that needs the most improvement. ELA and Math Achievement in 5th grade needs improvement also. And 5th grade Science achievement (35%) needs improvement.

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

Looking at the teacher and student surveys and examining the achievement data there seems to be a commonality with expectations. According to the staff they don't have those high expectations for the students and the students don't feel that they are challenged. Those two go hand in hand and center around collective efficacy. Revisiting The Opportunity Myth from TNPP and facilitating discussions with the teachers around high expectations for all could accelerate the learning.

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

Subgroup data increased in all groups except ELL ELA achievement. Math Achievement increased notably across grade levels.

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

The extreme focus on subgroup students and their data helped to improve their scores. We specifically focused on subgroup data during data discussions, reflected on their progress, and made sure that below grade level students were being served in intervention groups.

A focus was on assessing and teaching prerequisite skills in math as indicated by iready reports and reteaching skills based on exit ticket review.

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

The first step would be to target Tier 1 core instruction. Even though we made gains, a lot of that was due to learning gains and learning gains in the lowest 25%. By having rigorous Tier 1 instruction, where students are doing the work, we would lessen the number of students needing intervention support and make our work more effective. This year a math intervention time was built into the master schedule for each grade level. The teachers will continue to teach prerequisite skills and/or intervention skills in these groups.

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.

We have new BEST standards and new math curriculum this year in all grade levels. The bulk of our PD will be on Math BEST standards and curriculum as well as refining ELA Tier 1 instruction as we continue to implement BEST ELA standards and the new ELA curriculum. To target the work needed to improve our collective efficacy we will revisit The Opportunity Myth study by TNPP. We will have teacher walk throughs and identify trends and areas for growth opportunities.

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

The leadership team will continue regular walkthroughs in core subjects using the Instructional Practice Profile to ensure fidelity in teaching and feedback will be given to improve practice. Teachers will work with district math coach this year to plan lessons and learn the new BEST standards in math while learning the new curriculum. In Science, teachers will be administering formative assessments before instruction to determine prior knowledge and then administer summative assessments to determine proficiency.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need
from the data
reviewed.**

Multiple data points show that ELA proficiency needs to be increased. Subgroup data shows that SWD, BLK/AA, and ELL subgroups are below 41% Federal Index.

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

Proficiency levels will be 50% or higher in each subgroup and grade level.

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

Monitor classroom instruction with walk throughs Literacy Profile and Vision for Excellent Instruction.
Examine subgroup data after each progress monitoring session to determine levels of proficiency.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

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

Implementation of standards aligned core curriculum.
Collaborative planning
Data Chats
Intervention groups using evidenced based explicit instructional materials: Lexia, LLI, and 95% group

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

Implementation of standards aligned core curriculum will ensure that each teacher is focusing on the BEST standards during instruction. During Collaborative planning sessions teachers work together to plan evidence based lessons so that students are assured grade level appropriate work. Collaborative Data Chats will ensure that teachers are analyzing student performance data, using the data to inform instruction, and using the data to encourage student achievement and support the Reading Program. Teachers will discuss best practices, needs, and effective use of data. Intervention groups use evidence based instructional materials to ensure that individual student needs are being addressed.

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.

Teacher will design and implement a rigorous Tier 1 curriculum that is aligned with the BEST ELA standards through collaborative planning with their ELA teams, the Literacy Coach, and administration.

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

Teachers and the Literacy Team will examine assessment data to ensure that each subgroup is making the appropriate gains and on track to achieve proficiency on the BEST standards by the end of the year. The teams will examine screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, and summative data to drive instructional decisions.

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

Teachers and the Literacy team will implement evidence based intervention groups based on BPS decision trees to target groups of students who are not meeting defined proficiency standards.

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

Regular classroom walk throughs will be conducted using the Prek-5 Literacy Practice Profile to ensure that teachers are implementing a high quality reading instruction.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Although our overall math proficiency in grades 3-6 is 56%, some grade levels are lower than others. Students scoring level 3 or higher in 3rd grade was 69%, 4th grade 41%, in 5th grade 44%, and 6th grade 55%. We now have new curriculum for grades K-5 and Grade 6 along with new BEST standards for Math. This creates a prime opportunity to dive into the new standards and curriculum through professional development.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

The goals are:
1. To increase math achievement from 56% to 60%

Monitoring:

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

FAST progress monitoring will be used to monitor math proficiency. There are 3 PM windows.
iReady math diagnostic data will also be used to monitor math proficiency. Data will be monitored twice with iReady. Teachers will use formative assessments to monitor understanding daily and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Standards-aligned instruction
Standards-aligned assessment data monitoring
Differentiated small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small group differentiated instruction will target those students who need just-in time supports as they engage in standards-aligned grade level curriculum. Reteaching based on exit slips will provide targeted instruction based on what students need.

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.

Teachers will engage in professional development to learn about the BEST standards and new math curriculum during preplanning and continue throughout the year in grade level meetings and PD days.

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

Administration will initiate an observation and feedback schedule targeting specific areas of the Tier 1 Core instruction to make sure instruction aligns with the Vision for Excellent instruction.

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

The master schedule will include 15-20 minutes intervention block to reteach the skill from the previous day to those students whose exit slips showed a deficiency or provide the necessary prerequisite skills needed for students to be ready for the days learning.

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

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

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

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning sessions and support sessions with district math coach.

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

#3. 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. Science proficiency 3+ on 21-22 FSA = 35%. This has been low for the last 4 testing years and on a downward trend.

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 35% to 60%. This is 53/88 students scoring a 3 or above.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Walk throughs and feedback from administrators focused on the Elaborate phase of the 5E model and the hands on authentic engagement that the students have with the lesson material.

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. The BSCS 5E instructional model for science Observation and Feedback

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

Action Steps to Implement
 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Person Responsible

Kimberly Harris
(harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

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 56% of kindergarteners, 57% of 1st graders, and 67% of 2nd graders are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment.
- Planning sessions 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, 44 % of 4th Graders and 60% of 5th Graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2)
- Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in 3-5
- Planning sessions 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 25%.
- Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

- Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 25%.
- Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 50%.

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.

Harris, Kimberly, harris.kimberly@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 (Strong level of evidence)
 - o Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards
 - o Systematic and structured approach to the six critical areas of reading
 - o Science of Reading domains include PA, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension
- i-Ready (Promising level of evidence)
 - o Universal screener data is used to start data conversations at school level
 - o Formative data used to differentiate instruction
 - o This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning.
- Benchmark Advance
 - o All instructional materials are aligned with B.E.S.T. Standards
 - o Implementation of high-quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
 - o Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the “why” – with Science of Reading

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:

- 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
<p>Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Harris, Kimberly, harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Intervention material and instruction PD will be provided by Literacy Coach and/or Leadership Team o Establish a walk through rotation that includes teachers visiting other classrooms, identifying trends, and action steps to improve instructional practices. o Ensure that time is provided for teachers to meet weekly for professional development/planning. o Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions. 	<p>Harris, Kimberly, harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) at Andersen 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. 	<p>Pacarro, Laura, pacarro.laura@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.) 	

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.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 22-23 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty Insight surveys and a student Youth Truth Survey. These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

Student Survey- Youth Truth Survey

Student data from our Youth Truth survey indicate our lowest areas were with academic Challenge (10th percentile) and Instructional methods (3rd percentile). These focus areas will be addressed with the new math curriculum, teachers using multiple methods of engagement strategies with the students, planning for student centered lessons, more opportunities for discussions and collaboration with peers, and explaining the "why" of exit tickets and assessments that they take.

Parent Survey- Insight Survey

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school (94.25% yes), effectiveness of school's information being sent through email or text message, and information being sent from the Principal (91.82%). Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent/teacher communication (77.27% of families communicate weekly or monthly with their teacher compared to 58.41% of teachers that communicate with families weekly or monthly). To assist these areas of improvement we will use open house night for the teacher to explain his/her method of communication, we will encourage all families to download the FOCUS app to stay connected, and push out weekly/monthly communications with parents. 98 written responses of ways to strengthen family engagement at Andersen were given. Ways we can strengthen family engagement is to host family fun/learning nights such as literacy night and math night for all families to be involved in, we will increase our extra curricular activities to include chess club, lego club, homework help, and a running club. We will also encourage families to volunteer at school.

Teacher- Insight Survey

Our faculty insight survey also included areas of strength that included Leadership (5.7/10) and Instructional Planning (5.4/10). Target areas for improvement include the Learning Environment (4.0/10) and Academic Expectations (3.2/10). To target the areas of improvement we will do more to define expectations for behaviors and practice in class and around the school, be more consistent with behavior actions following the BPS behavior plan, follow district pacing guides in ELA and Math so that all teachers understand what is expected. Now that we are a year into the new ELA curriculum teachers will be more comfortable with the new program and be able to make it more of their own while still following the lesson pacing guides.

Additionally, we will implement research based SEL curriculum to provide targeted instruction to help ease the impact of COVID19's emotional hardships.

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

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.

*Teachers communicate high expectations for all students. The faculty is in their 3rd year of Conscious Discipline Training which helps us better handle their mindset before problem solving with our students. We also use PBIS as a way to communicate expectations and teach students to follow the SOAR expectations at our school. Teachers have multiple opportunities throughout the month to collaborate with their peers, be involved in professional development, and work on professional goals with the teams and administrative partners.

*Parents are involved from before school starts. We host registration day that brought families in to register their students and have some fun in the process (free give aways from business partners) to meet the teacher day, and open house to initiate parent involvement in the school.

*Leaders at the school model, connect, and involve all stakeholders at Andersen. Leaders model the expectations, connect families to the school and staff to each other, and use multiple strategies to involve all stakeholders (SAC, teacher leadership opportunities, business partner relationships, and encourage volunteering opportunities). The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff.

*Students at school are given high expectations for behaviors and academics through a rigorous curriculum and PBIS SOAR expectations. Fun events are made available for students to cash in their earned Eagle Bucks during the school day and after school the students have extra curricular opportunities as well as after school programs to strengthen their academics.