

Brevard Public Schools

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	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
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)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	<p>2017-18: B</p> <p>2016-17: B</p> <p>2015-16: B</p> <p>2014-15: A</p> <p>2013-14: A</p>
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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

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 and position title 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 teacher's 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.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	24
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
Attendance below 90 percent	13	25	37	32	24	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	3	4	9	7	9	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	0	6	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	6	4	7	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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

NOTE: 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
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%				
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				
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
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

The learning gains of the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math showed the lowest performance. Students with disabilities and Black/African American students showed the lowest performance in achievement. 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 decrease is a weak core instruction resulting in overidentification of students needing interventions.

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

The lowest 25% in math decreased from 50% to 28%. 6th grade and 4th grade math cohort comparisons also decreased significantly. This resulted from weak core instruction in math.

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

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.

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 4 percentage points and ELA Learning Gains, although low, increased 10 percentage points. Last year's SIP Goal of standards-based writing tasks could have factored in to this improvement. Throughout the year, ELA grade level tasks were analyzed by the leadership team for alignment and feedback was provided to the teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One potential area of concern is the increase of students scoring a level 1 across grades 4-6.

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 with disabilities.
5. Increase achievement of our Black/African American students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase reading performance by focusing on standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.
Rationale	Overall 59% of students were proficient in ELA. Breaking it down into subgroups shows that only 45% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains in ELA. Only 32% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) and 39% of Black/African American students were proficient in ELA. By implementing solid Tier 1 instruction during the 90 minute reading block the teachers will provide on-grade level instruction and differentiated small group instruction to target students' specific needs.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The goals are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Differentiated small group instruction. Collaborative Planning Standards-aligned instruction Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers cannot teach one lesson to the whole group to target instruction of specific standards at each student's level. After data has been analyzed, the students' needs will be met on two levels. During the 90 minute reading block, small group instruction will be able to meet the students' specific needs. The Walk to Intervention block will target students that need more specific support than the small group instruction occurring during the 90 minute reading block can give them.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue support (planning time, professional development, and implementation) of Tier I standards-in ELA, including the implementation of the Standards-Focused Boards and differentiated instruction. 2. Teachers will identify and monitor students in the following subgroups: Lowest 25%, Students with Disabilities, and Black/African Americans on data spreadsheet. 3. The literacy coach will facilitate collaborative planning and coach teachers implementing standards-based lessons by observing and providing feedback. 4. Administration and literacy coach will provide support for the implementation and monitoring of the MTSS process. 5. Invite targeted subgroups to the Academic Support Program (ASP). 6. Teachers will allow for 45 minutes of online iready reading instruction during the week. 7. Teachers will analyze iready online instruction data to drive instruction, motivate and set goals with students. 8. Teachers, Literacy Coach, and Administration will collaborate to determine the best use of time and resources to support interventions.

- 9. Instructional Reviews conducted by district and school level administration to observe and give feedback on the instructional process.
- 10. The literacy coach will define the 90 minute reading block and work with teachers to support implementing the 90 minute reading block with fidelity.

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

#2

Title Increase math performance by focusing on standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.

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.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve
 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.

Action Step

Description
 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 (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Hans Christian Andersen Elementary will begin year one of implementing PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support). The teachers will align their classroom expectations to the School-wide SOAR expectations of Safety First, On Task , Always Respectful, and Responsible. These same SOAR expectations create a common language for setting expectations in all parts of the school building. The goal is to decrease misbehavior by reinforcing the good behaviors. Students will earn Eagle Bucks when displaying the SOAR expectations. Eagle Bucks can be redeemed in a variety of ways in the classroom and/or for school-wide incentives.