Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hoffman, Patricia	SAC Member	The media Specialist is Andersen's School Improvement Chairperson. The SAC chair engages the school's stakeholders in the decision making process.
Harris, Kimberly	Principal	As Andersen Elementary' s primary instructional leader, the principal plans and coordinates professional development, conducts classroom walk-throughs, conducts formal and informal observations, provides feedback and facilitates conversations with teachers about their practice.
Pacarro, Laura	Instructional Coach	As a teacher leader, the instructional coach conducts professional development to enhance the teachers' understanding of the Florida 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 Elementary, the Assistant Principal conducts walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, feedback sessions with teachers, acts as the PBIS chairperson, monitors discipline, and conducts professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Kimberly Harris T

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	83	88	71	89	90	80	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	9	15	10	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	5	5	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	92	114	105	90	122	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	2	10	8	5	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	3	4	9	6	10	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	13	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	5	6	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	92	114	105	90	122	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	2	10	8	5	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	3	4	9	6	10	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	13	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	5	6	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	57%	59%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	60%	58%	49%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	57%	53%	35%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	62%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	46%	65%	62%	54%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	53%	51%	50%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	47%	57%	53%	74%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	60%	1%	54%	7%
	2018	52%	63%	-11%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
06	2019	56%	67%	-11%	55%	1%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
	2018	73%	57%	16%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	52	50	43	49	42	25	37				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	23	29	24	19	34	36	50				
BLK	33	43	33	40	30	25	67				
HSP	63	42		78	72		100				
MUL	56	50		65	46						
WHT	64	52	44	64	57	59	71				
FRL	51	43	24	54	46	45	69				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	36
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	59
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	52
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	51
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

FSA Pre COVID 18/19 SY: The learning gains of the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math showed the lowest performance. 32% of the students with disabilities were proficient in reading and math. Of the Black/African American students only 39% were proficient in ELA and 48% were proficient in math. In Science only 10% of the Students with Disabilities and 12% of the Black/African American students were proficient. Contributing to this is a need to continue strengthening core instruction and hone our process of identifying students needing interventions. (Data From SIP 19-20)

Pre-Covid:
iReady Reading - Percentage On Grade Level
19/20 Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K- 57%/76% +19
1- 27%/48% +21
2- 23%/46% +23
3- 50%/76% +26
4- 37%/48% +11
5- 39%/46% +7
6- 31%40% +9 **

Pre-Covid:
iReady Math- Percentage On Grade Level
19/20 Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K- 31%/59% +28
1- 18%/43% +25
2- 5%/16% +11 **
3- 11%/31% +20
4- 30%/45% +15
5- 32%/44% +12
6- 32%/47% +15

Post COVID
iReady Math- Percentage On Grade Level
20/21 D1Rdg/ D1Math
K-NA/NA
1-19%/ 22%
2- 36%/ 20%
3- 55%/ 8%
4- 28%/ 13%
5- 37%/ 26%

6- 46%/ 27%
The lowest performance in iReady reading was the 6th grade with the lowest percentage of on grade level students and the second to lowest growth from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2. The lowest performance in iReady math was the 2nd grade with the lowest percentage of on grade level students and the lowest growth of all 7 grade levels.

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

iReady Data Cohort Comparison
iReady Reading - Percentage On Grade Level
19-20 Diagnostic 1/ 19-20Diagnostic 2/ 20-21 Diagnostic1
K- 57%/76%/19% -57 **
1- 27%/48%/ 36% -12
2- 23%/46%/36% -10
3- 50%/76%/55% -21
4- 37%/48%/28% -20
5- 39%/46%/37% -9
6- 31%40%/NA

iReady Math- Percentage On Grade Level
19-20 Diagnostic 1/19-20 Diagnostic 2/20-21 Diagnostic 1
K- 31%/59%/22% -37 **
1- 18%/43%/20% -23
2- 5%/16%/8% -8
3- 11%/31%/13% -18
4- 30%/45%/26% -19
5- 32%/44%/27% -17
6- 32%/47%/NA

The greatest decline from last year's final iReady diagnostic to this year's beginning diagnostic is in this year's 1st graders for both reading and math. This is especially concerning because the younger students need the foundational skills taught in kindergarten. The loss of direct instruction due to Distance Learning could have been a contributing factor to this decline.

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

School Average/ State Average
ELA Achievement= 59%/57% +2
ELA Learning Gains= 53%/58% -5
ELA Lowest 25% = 45%/53% -8
Math Achievement=59%/63% -4
Math LG= 46%/62% -16**
Math L25% = 28%/51% -23**
Science Achievement = 47%/53% -6

When compared to the state average, students had the greatest gaps in Math Learning Gains (-16) and Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% (-23). This is resulting from core instruction not being aligned to the standards.

Looking at Gap Data, the greatest GAP between the school and the State is in the ELL population. The point Gap between non-ELL and ELL is 41% at Hans Christian Andersen

compared to the State at 28%. This is not one of our identified ESSA subgroups, but worth watching and identifying more supports we can give our ELL population.

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

ELA showed the most improvement overall. The ELA Achievement stayed steady at 59%. ELA learning gains increased four percentage points and ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25%, although low, increased ten percentage points. The prior year's SIP Goal of standards-based writing tasks could have factored into this improvement. Throughout the year, ELA grade level tasks were analyzed by the leadership team for alignment and feedback was provided to the teachers. (Data from SIP 19-20)

Pre-Covid:
iReady Reading - Percentage On Grade Level
19/20 Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K- 57%/76% +19
1- 27%/48% +21
2- 23%/46% +23
3- 50%/76% +26 **
4- 37%/48% +11
5- 39%/46% +7
6- 31%40% +9

Pre-Covid:
iReady Math- Percentage On Grade Level
19/20 Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K- 31%/59% +28 **
1- 18%/43% +25
2- 5%/16% +11
3- 11%/31% +20
4- 30%/45% +15
5- 32%/44% +12
6- 32%/47% +15

The most growth last year from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 was in 3rd grade reading and Kindergarten Math. Last year, we implemented common planning. These teams collaborated extensively throughout the year in formal sessions and weekly team meetings following district pacing guides and implementation plans.

The percentage point gap of Black/African Americans, decrease from 21% in 17-18 to 17% in 18-19 SY. The percentage point gap of SWD decreased from 54% in 17-18 to 33% in 18-19. We will continue to identify these students to ensure they are provided with supports needed for success.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance is an area of concern this year. Last year 55 students had an attendance rate of less than 90%. Already this year from Aug-Sept that number is 90 students. Attendance will be discussed at our data meetings and a plan put in place to reach out to parents after 3 absences. This is complicated by COVID requirements of students being in quarantine for multiple reasons and eLearning students not logging into their virtual classrooms.

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

1. Increase learning gains of lowest 25% in ELA.
2. Increase learning gains of lowest 25% in math.
3. Increase Science achievement.
4. Increase achievement of our students in the ESSA subgroups: SWD, Black/African American, and ELL.
5.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall 37% of students in grades 1-6 are considered on-grade level according to Diagnostic 1 iReady data from September 2020. This is down from December 2019 Diagnostic 2 data that showed 51% of students on-grade level. By focusing on Standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, differentiating within the 90 minute reading block, planning collaboratively, and identifying below grade level students through the MTSS process reading proficiency will increase.
Measureable Outcome:	The goals are to: 1. Increase ELA achievement by 15% from 59.5% to 68%. 2. Increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 20% from 53% to 63%. 3. Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making learning gains by 20% from 45% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated small group instruction. Collaborative Planning Standards-aligned instruction Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 1 instruction must be standards-aligned and differentiated according to students' needs to increase student proficiency. Instruction must be addressed on two levels: during the 90 minute reading block and during the intervention block. The intervention group will target students that need skill specific support beyond what the 90 minute reading block can provide.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Identify and monitor students in the following subgroups: Lowest 25%, students with disabilities, and Black/African American students on data spreadsheets.
2.Literacy coach will facilitate collaborative planning with grade level teams to support Tier 1 standards-aligned instruction using the Standards Focus Documents focusing on the standard being taught, the assessment to assess mastery, and student tasks that are to the depth of the standard.
3.Administration and Literacy Coach will provide support for the implementation and monitoring of the MTSS process.
4.Students will take two Standards Mastery Assessments each nine weeks.
5.Teachers will analyze iReady data to drive instruction, motivate, and set goals with students.
6.The literacy coach and administration will provide support for Tier 1 differentiating using iReady Toolbox lessons to provide targeted instruction based on results from Standards Mastery Assessments and Diagnostics.
7.Principal and AP will provide consistent observations with actionable feedback and monitor the change in practice.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall math proficiency was 59%. Breaking the data into subgroups show that only 28% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains. Only 33% of the students with disabilities were proficient in math. 48% of the Black/African American students were proficient in math.
Measureable Outcome:	The goals are to: 1. Increase Math achievement by 15% from 59% to 68%. 2. Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math by 20% from 46% to 55%. 3. Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making learning gains by 50% from 28% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Harris (harris.kimberly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of iReady. Standards-aligned instruction Reteaching through the use of exit slips
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Following up lessons with exit slips and reteaching to those students that didn't grasp the concept will provide support to those students not reaching proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will post standards and refer to the standard at the onset of each lesson.
2. Administration will initiate an observation and feedback schedule with specific areas of focus each week,
3. Teachers will provide exit slips at the conclusion of each lesson to determine level of proficiency of the focus standard(s).
4. Teachers will build in 10-15 minutes at the beginning of each block to reteach the skill from the previous day to those students who's exit slips showed a deficiency.
5.Teachers will identify and monitor iReady diagnostic data with an emphasis on the lowest 25%, SWD and Black/African American Subgroups.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Academic Support Program (ASP)- Teachers will identify students that are below grade level, substantially deficient, and/or absent during distance learning provided in the 19/20 school year in reading and math. After school sessions will provide targeted lessons for these students in grades 1-2. Additional CARES Act funds will be used to provide after school support to students in grades 3-6 that are identified as below grade level or substantially deficient.

Data Team Meetings: Grade level teams will meet weekly to discuss Tier 1 data in reading, math, and SEL/attendance. The focus will be on looking at class data and ensuring that struggling students are identified and provided with supports to move them to proficiency. MTSS meetings that include the teachers, literacy coach, administration, school counselor, and the ESE Support Specialist are held once a month to discuss interventions, supports, and response to the interventions, all in an effort to move the students towards proficiency and close the learning gap.

Walk to Success: Pre-COVID, teachers worked with their grade level teams to identify students in need of intervention services and, as a team, determined which teachers would teach the identified skill to students from the different classes. This year, due to COVID restrictions, the teachers will be providing their interventions to only their students. Activity teachers, Resource Teachers, the gifted teacher, and the speech pathologists are assigned to grade level teams to provide additional support during their intervention times.

Attendance: The attendance rate has noticeably decreased compared to last year at this time. This could be due to eLearning attendance and technology struggles, but nerveless, must be addressed. Teachers will follow truancy procedures for students that have three or more absences. Teachers will attempt to make contact after a three day absence to check in on the students and attempt to explain to the parent the importance of being present each day.

Conscious Discipline and the Trauma Informed Classroom professional development will be conducted to increase awareness of trauma and its effects on classroom performance to decrease the gap between our subgroups of students and their non-subgroup counterparts.

Culturally Responsive Teaching: The gap between identified subgroups of students and their non-subgroup counterparts shows a need for a shift in instructional practices at Andersen. The staff will have professional development on culturally responsive teaching. This will assist the teachers in making instructional decisions to be inclusive of all students. Teachers will understand why it is important to set high expectations for all students, provide students with missing background knowledge, and be aware of unintended biases that can negatively affect achievement of subgroups of students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Teachers were invited to be reflective on current school practices and define action steps needed to address areas of improvement based on student data. We will continue to address these areas of focus into this school year. Teachers, parents, community members, and students were invited to participate in surveys of school culture; Insight Surveys and the Youth Truth Survey. These surveys allow stakeholders to voice their opinion on what areas the school is doing well in and what areas could use improvement. The results of last year's survey have been shared with those stakeholders. Based on these surveys, we will continue with our PBIS program building on what we have set in place to earn Tier 1 Gold School status and working on building up our Tier 2 practices. We will add more recognition awards to the nine week ceremony in an effort to recognize more students for their efforts and pull in more families to school events. The entire staff is being trained in Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Classrooms to be able to provide themselves and their students with supports necessary to process the events of the past year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.