

Brevard Public Schools

Spessard L. Holland 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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spessard L. Holland Elementary School

50 HOLLAND CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Alison L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2016

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)	28%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (80%) 2020-21: (73%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%)
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	N/A
* 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.

To help all students develop skills, concepts, attitudes, and values that enable them to be successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Looking toward our children's future with challenging learning experiences that will lead to success.

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
Alison, Samantha	Principal	<p>As the principal, Mrs. Alison is responsible for effectively interpreting student data and communicating the strengths and areas of improvement to the Holland Elementary stakeholders. She is an active member of the School Advisory Council and collaborates with the council in discussions and decisions to support the continual improvement of Holland Elementary. She effectively communicates the school improvement goals and the actions required for implementation. Throughout the school year, she monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan to ensure that it is being done with fidelity and that it is a living, breathing document that can be adjusted to meet the changing needs of our school. Mrs. Alison also facilitates MTSS Monday Meetings, Leadership Team Meetings, and Data Team Meetings to lead the monitoring of student progress. She actively acquires materials and resources for teachers to support their curriculum and instruction. She builds systems to retain an outstanding workforce in order to provide the best possible culture for teaching and learning.</p>

Smith, Tonya	Reading Coach	<p>Mrs. Smith monitors the implementation of the BEST ELA Standards and the Benchmark Advance and SAVVAS Programs. She mentors new classroom teachers through lesson modeling, lesson plan design, lesson structures, and facilitation of peer observations. She also serves as the Lead Mentor and completes the coaching cycle with teachers as needed. Mrs. Smith supports professional development, monitors i-Ready usage fidelity, pass rates, and data development for progress monitoring. She leads the i-Ready school-wide incentive program. Mrs. Smith helps monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, is an active member of the MTSS Leadership Team and Data Team Meetings, and attends weekly leadership team meetings.</p>
--------------	---------------	--

Math Coach	<p>Jessica Clouda monitors the implementation of the BEST Mathematics Standards and the Reveal and EdGems Programs. She leads professional development in the new programs, mathematics best practices, and small-group instruction. She helps monitor performance and progress monitoring data to inform future PD and instruction.</p>
------------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Thursday 7/28/2016, Samantha Alison L

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.*

6

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

438

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

4

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

4

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	51	57	68	54	60	69	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	10	7	9	11	7	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/27/2022

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	56	72	51	60	69	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	5	1	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	3	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	6	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	56	72	51	60	69	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	5	1	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	3	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	6	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	84%	61%	56%	79%			71%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	84%	63%	61%	78%			65%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	81%	54%	52%	59%			42%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	60%	60%	79%			81%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%	64%	64%	88%			81%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	55%	55%	79%			64%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	56%	51%	50%			74%	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	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	85%	60%	25%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	91%	67%	24%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

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	46	69	63	49	65	53					
BLK	83			67							
HSP	76	80		64	75						
MUL	100			80							
WHT	84	82	77	81	78	75	83				
FRL	75	78	81	63	72	83	62				
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	50	58	46	50	75	73	29				
BLK	69			46							
HSP	81	85		81	100		40				
MUL	90			90							
WHT	78	77	56	79	88	76	53				
FRL	70	63		63	79		47				
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	36	52	50	50	59	60	33				
BLK	50			42							
HSP	67	59		70	100						
MUL	88			94							
WHT	72	65	39	83	78	57	75				
FRL	50	51	47	67	68	54	57				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
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	90
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	80
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	73
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?

According to 2022 FSA results, Holland Elementary demonstrated significant growth in ELA and Science. An increase was noted in four out of the seven reporting categories, with the overall points increasing by 50 from 2021, and 34 from 2019, totaling an 84-point increase over the past two years. Holland earned 562 overall points on it's School Report Card in 2022, the highest number in its history. Students scored above the state and district averages in all reporting categories. From 2016 to 2021, our students with disabilities made some progress, however, this subgroup continues to score significantly lower than all others. In 2022, black students increased their performance in ELA by 14 points and math by 19 points. Scores were maintained or increased across all grade levels in ELA and some grade levels in math. Third-grade math is an area in need of support, as well as the SWD subgroup, both being the lowest areas.

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

In analyzing core content area data, although proficiency levels for all students in mathematics were maintained at 79%, learning gains for 4-6 graders dropped by nine percentage points, and five for the lowest quartile.

Additionally, FSA scores show that on the writing portion of the ELA, the median score achieved by our 4th through 6th graders was a 6 out of a possible 10.

In analyzing subgroup data, students with disabilities scored at 46% proficiency in ELA, a decrease of 4 percentage points from 2021; although there were strong increases in learning gains, proficiency levels are the lowest of all subgroups. SWD maintained proficiency levels in math, but dropped in learning gains.

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

A strong focus on ELA instruction and new program implementation may have diminished the focus on small-group mathematics instruction and mathematics intervention, resulting in a decrease in learning gains for all students and those in the lowest quartile. In order to address this need, PD on the new mathematics program will begin early in the school year, along with the support of the mathematics coach. A focus on small-group instruction and mathematics intervention will occur during PD and data conversations.

For writing, it is clear that one year of implementation of the Holland Writing Plan is not sufficient for pervasive and implementation with integrity to occur. An additional year of PD and support from the Literacy Leadership Team in collaboration with the Writing Resource Teacher will solidify teachers' understanding of instructional practices and full use of materials provided within the Holland Plan and Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS writing materials.

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

ELA, in all areas, proficiency and both learning gains categories, increased according to FSA data. The most significant increase in ELA was in learning gains for the lowest 25% which went from 59% in 2021 to 81% in 2022, a 22-percentage point increase. The other content area that increased significantly was Science. Proficiency levels went from 50% in 2021 to 81% in 2022, a 31-percentage point increase.

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

In ELA, our school focused on increasing writing scores with a new school-wide writing plan, implementing the new BEST Standards and Benchmark Program with fidelity, and monitoring student-performance data closely. Tier 2 and 3 interventions and the MTSS process were also an area of focus for continuous improvement. The professional practice of Writing Across the Curriculum was implemented as part of our 2021-2022 School Improvement Plan. This strategy is researched-based and has proven to increase students' critical thinking skills, helping prepare them for the expectations of the workforce. An effect size higher than .4 is considered to be above average with writing having an effect size of .46. Holland's Schoolwide Writing Plan in conjunction with the writing expectations in the newly-adopted ELA programs was the the focus of professional development and our school improvement process in order to accelerate learning. This and the other actions taken proved successful in increasing ELA performance. Instructional staff changes were made in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.

In science, a new teacher began instructing in the 21-22 school year, and she implemented the district-adopted curriculum, brought back hands-on experimentation labs (which were not used as frequently in 2020-21 due to COVID), and utilized Penda with fidelity. These actions led to a significant increase of proficiency scores in Science.

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

Holland will continue to implement Writing Across the Curriculum as the professional practice goal of our 2022-2023 School Improvement Plan, along with small-group mathematics instruction. Writing across the curriculum is researched-based and has proven to increase students' critical thinking skills, helping prepare them for the expectations of the workforce. John Hattie's research states that scaffolding for all to have access to Tier 1 on grade-level instruction. An effect size higher than .4 is considered to be above average with writing having an effect size of .46. Holland's Schoolwide Writing Plan in conjunction with the writing expectations in the newly-adopted ELA programs will be the focus of professional development and our school improvement process in order to accelerate learning. As an additional strategy, to address the declines in learning gains for all and the lowest 25% of students, small-group mathematics instruction will also be implemented, with the support of Holland's shared mathematics coach. She will conduct PD throughout the school year, conduct walkthroughs, and provide individual feedback to teachers. She will also provide support for the strong implementation of the new mathematics programs, Reveal and EdGems.

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.

Professional Development for writing and collaboration with ELA Content Specialist for Brevard Public Schools, will continue in 22-23. The content specialist will provide training for fourth through sixth-grade teachers and students on Best Practices for Writing Instruction, related to changes required for FAST. The cohesive school-wide writing plan with standardized practices across grade levels developed last school year will be updated in collaboration with the content specialist. The plan, which included a content-focused timeline, writing samples, rubrics, teacher resources, and BEST Standards, will be a focus of PD. Continued focus will be on a systemic change in writing instruction that includes common terminology and practices across grade levels. The committee integrated the new reading series into the school writing objectives to create a cohesive plan, and will continue to perfect it this year. The Literacy Leadership Team along with the support of the District Content Specialist will continue to provide professional development in the area of writing instruction throughout the school year.

Due to declines in learning gains for all and the lowest 25% of students, mathematics PD was given at the onset of the school year, during the September early-release PD with our math coach, and will continue throughout the school year. Teachers will receive real-time feedback after classroom walkthroughs from the math coach as well.

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

Routine Literacy Leadership Team meetings, with a focus on writing, will continue to occur in order to plan for and carry out professional development opportunities to sustain the development of best instructional practices in writing, considering the new expectations of FAST. The SIP/Professional Development Team will also continue and will support the planning, development, and delivery of professional development opportunities, and will also continue to monitor school improvement action steps, goals, and progress monitoring throughout the school year. A team of Holland will also implement the Academic Support Program to support our lowest 25% students with additional intervention. Our activity teachers will provide additional instruction for students in various grade levels during the school day, in collaboration with classroom teachers to incorporate content skills into the activity classes.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In analyzing core content area data, the average student score on FSA Writing remained a 6/10. In analyzing subgroup data, students with disabilities scored at 46% proficiency in ELA, a decrease of 4 percentage points from 2021; although there were strong increases in learning gains, proficiency levels are the lowest of all subgroups.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Holland will continue to implement writing across the curriculum/writing to raise achievement as the professional practice goal of our 2022-2023 School Improvement Plan, along with small-group mathematics instruction. Writing across the curriculum/writing to raise achievement is a researched-based practice that has been proven to increase students' critical thinking skills, helping prepare them for the expectations of the workforce. John Hattie and Max Thompson's research indicate that writing to raise achievement have a significant effect size (.82) on student performance. An effect size higher than .4 is considered to be above average with writing having an effect size of .46. Holland's Schoolwide Writing Plan in conjunction with the writing expectations in the newly-adopted ELA programs will be the focus of professional development and our school improvement process in order to accelerate learning.

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

In writing, the average student score will be 8/10, or a commensurate score as indicated by FAST Writing.

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

Periodic district writing assessments will be reviewed by grade-level teams and at data meetings. Classroom walkthroughs will focus on both writing instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based

Writing across the curriculum/to raise achievement and implementation of Holland's Writing Plan, with an update for FAST writing expectations. We will also continue with data-driven and standards-based instruction, and self-assessed learners (student data chats).

strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based

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

In order to perfect our writing practices and strategies, and make them a habit, a second year is being implemented. Learning to write, and write well, has a number of benefits. It is a crucial life skill that not only helps students to succeed in school, but it's also vital to success in the "real" world. Writing studies have shown that writing helps boost student achievement across the board because it actively engages children. Writing helps to reinforce the knowledge in the brain and activates neurons. Writing to Inform and Writing to Learn have been proven to be one of the strongest influences on increasing students' reading levels. Most importantly, preparing students for the workforce where they will be expected to write coherent, intelligent content is priority. Writing Programs have a .46 effect size and writing to raise achievement has a .82, according to John Hattie/McREL research.

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.

Continue to build upon our Literacy Leadership team who has formulated a school-wide writing plan and writing plan binder, that includes common planning, common terminology /language, and common process with the TEA chart for each teacher that will be utilized throughout the school year. Expectations for FAST Writing will be added this year.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Provide professional development in writing and integrate it through all content areas starting during pre-planning and continuing throughout the school year. This will be implemented with teacher leaders and through collaboration with our district content specialist.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Conduct mock writing assessments and scoring opportunities. Provide feedback and coaching to teachers and students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Hodge (hodge.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Although proficiency levels for all students in mathematics were maintained at 79%, learning gains for 4-6 graders dropped by nine percentage points, and five for the lowest quartile. SWD maintained proficiency levels in math, but dropped in learning gains. As an additional strategy, to address the declines in learning gains for all and the lowest 25% of students, small-group mathematics instruction will also be implemented, with the support of Holland's shared mathematics coach. She will conduct PD throughout the school year, conduct walkthroughs, and provide individual feedback to teachers. She will also provide support for the strong implementation of the new mathematics programs, Reveal and EdGems.

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

In mathematics, learning gains will increase for all students and the lowest 25% in FAST Mathematics. 82% of students will demonstrate an annual learning gain on FAST, and 77% of students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate an annual learning gain.

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

Mathematics will be monitored via FAST, i-Ready, and district assessments within Reveal and EdGems. Classroom walkthroughs will focus on mathematics instruction, small-group and intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

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

Small-group mathematics instruction will be implemented, as teachers implement the new BEST Standards via Reveal and EdGems Mathematics Programs.

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

John Hattie found that small group instruction has an effect size of .47, making it an effective practice. Since performance data revealed a decline in learning gains in math for all students, small-group instruction will allow teachers to provide rigorous, grade-level instruction in small groups in order to close any learning gaps in mathematics.

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.

Provide PD in the area of mathematics at each early-release professional development session, with a focus on small-group instruction and intervention.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Conduct mathematics classroom walkthroughs monthly and provide actionable feedback to faculty.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Monitor mathematics performance on district assessments, and discuss interventions and/or changes in practices required as a result.

Person Responsible Samantha Alison (alison.samantha@brevardschools.org)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Objective 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.), Holland will continue to broaden it's implementation of Restorative Practices across all grade levels, and Conscious Discipline in grades kindergarten through two. The "Bee the Change" Character Campaign and monthly awards ceremonies will continue in all grades as well, along with i-Ready incentives for growth and participation.

For staff, Holland provides many tokens of appreciation for teachers throughout the year, and at every early-release PD, there are themed snacks to show gratitude for teachers' hard work. Holland's teachers responded to the annual Insight Survey given in the winter of 2021, which is an index used by the district to measure the school's culture, which serves as a leading indicator for student achievement and teacher retention. Holland increased its scores in 11 out of 11 domains from 2020 to 2021. The domains with the strongest scores were School Operations 7.0, Professional Development 7.7, and Learning Environment 7.5. Areas of opportunity are Academic Expectations 6.6 and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion 6.8. Holland's Parent Survey indicated strong customer satisfaction with Holland's warm, inviting culture/environment, competent faculty and staff, clean environment, and academics, specifically, with gifted homerooms and instruction. The area identified as a growth opportunity continues to be consistency in communication across grade levels and teachers. Students at Holland Elementary were surveyed in January 2022 about their perceptions of their school. The highest-rated areas were Culture and Engagement. The areas with the greatest growth opportunities were Instructional Methods and Academic Challenge.

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

First established in January of 2020, Holland is a Restorative Practices school. Restorative Practices is a system of formal and informal processes that build and sustain a culture of kindness, respect, and responsibility. This is achieved by emphasizing the importance of trusting relationships. Holland is in its second year of implementation and the Chair of the Restorative Practices Team Katie Manifold, provided a review of the important tenets of Restorative Practice and along with the RP team, will provide additional PD and support for the faculty throughout the school year. The guidance department and administration utilize these practices with fidelity when addressing trauma, emotional/behavioral, and disciplinary situations. Teachers continue to utilize affective statements and routine classroom circles to build community. Holland will continue to hone and develop RP strategies and work to ensure pervasive implementation.

Conscious Discipline continues to provide an array of behavior management strategies and classroom structures that teachers can use to turn everyday situations into learning opportunities. Loving Guidance, Inc. (2019). Conscious Discipline training was introduced during pre-planning in 2020 to kindergarten through second-grade teachers with training throughout the 2020-2021 school year. The second year of implementation started during preplanning of 2021. The strategies continue to be practiced and implemented in 22-23.

Sensory Pathways are in the process of being implemented this school year in order to assist students in a proactive manner with movement and sensory stimulation.

Quarterly awards ceremonies will continue to be conducted to celebrate outstanding achievement both academically and behaviorally.