Lockmar Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lockmar Elementary School

525 PEPPER ST NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Campione A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2000

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)	96%
2018-19 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	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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.

Table of Contents

Lockmar Elementary School

525 PEPPER ST NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Lockmar parents, staff and students will strive to achieve our vision for excellence.
ACHIEVEMENT – To continue the pursuit of outstanding academic performance.
CURRICULUM – To monitor our curriculum and update technological areas for the future needs of our children and society.
UNITY – To unify the staff, students, parents, and members of the community to mold Lockmar into an extended family.
RESPECT – To develop self-esteem, respect for others, and positive attitudes.
COMMUNITY – To use all resources in providing enrichment and experiences for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lockmar, Where Minds Open To The Future

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
Hostetler, Norma	Principal	Principal oversees day to day functions at the school by addressing students', parents', and teachers' needs as they arise. Principal supervises the implementation of SIP and monitors outcome of the measurable goals set.
Moffitt, Manuela	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach analyzes school data across all grade levels. Instructional coach supports teachers in regards to testing, instruction, and intervention needs. Instructional coach monitors the action steps specifically related to math achievement across the school, focusing on i-Ready. Instructional coach will also lead monthly Teacher Administrator Coach (TAC) meetings in which instruction and student achievement throughout the year is closely monitored.
Buckingham, Meagan	Teacher, K-12	Teacher plans lessons, instructs, and assesses students. Teacher monitors student achievement and addresses needs at MTSS and TAC meetings, seeking support from the team as needed. Teacher is also SAC chair and will provide School Improvement Plan to SAC, and take their suggestions to ensure that the SIP is addressing our schools greatest needs. Teacher will answer questions and clear up misconceptions about the SIP. SAC will host monthly meetings in which grade level teachers will share presentations about how they are providing support for the SIP.
Bradish, Kristina	School Counselor	Guidance counselor provides support for students' social emotional needs. Guidance counselor attends MTSS meetings in order to assist teachers with interventions or provide support for students who have needs outside of what the classroom teacher can provide. Guidance counselor works with students on a personal level so that they can be successful in the classroom.
Nelson, Sandra	Other	ESE support specialist assists with students who have academic, speech, and social emotional needs. ESE support specialist facilitates IPST meetings that occur to help students within the lowest 25% get the help that they need.
Long, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal provides support for instruction/curriculum, disciplinary situations as needed, and interventions. Assistant principal ensures that teachers are working with the lowest 25% and identifying low achieving students to ensure that they are getting the help that they need.

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	78	105	87	127	79	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	685
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	8	10	8	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	13	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	28	39	25	30	40	43	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	251

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	4	8	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/12/2019

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	8	54	36	66	33	29	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	1	15	16	18	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
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	10	16	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	6	8	4	1	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	68%	62%	57%	66%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	57%	53%	57%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	64%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	65%	62%	57%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	51%	40%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	57%	53%	53%	56%	51%

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	78 (0)	105 (0)	87 (0)	127 (0)	79 (0)	104 (0)	105 (0)	685 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	13 ()	8 ()	10 ()	8 ()	9 ()	11 ()	66 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (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)	2 (0)	13 (0)	16 (0)	20 (0)	51 (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	65%	64%	1%	58%	7%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
06	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	64%	-4%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	52%	60%	-8%	60%	-8%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
	2018	64%	68%	-4%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	61	56	34	47	43	26				
ELL	42	56	47	47	56	38	20				
BLK	39	50	54	21	39	43	33				
HSP	65	68	47	56	60	32	56				
MUL	65	80		48	69						
WHT	74	72	74	68	69	59	67				
FRL	59	66	62	51	59	45	51				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	37	37	16	34	54	48	43				
ELL	39	33	31	30	36	38					
BLK	44	36	6	43	44	35	23				
HSP	52	42	35	51	52	44	56				
MUL	62	65		40	31		50				
WHT	63	47	26	65	54	53	70				
FRL	54	44	23	50	48	45	52				

2017 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	35	49	36	33	40	34	18				
ELL	43	53	60	39	44						
BLK	52	56	57	46	45	26	42				
HSP	70	67	67	61	63	57	41				
MUL	64	60		54	35						
WHT	68	64	48	70	60	41	62				
FRL	60	59	51	57	53	42	46				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 data component that showed the lowest performance was 47% of the Lowest 25th Percentile made learning gains in math. Contributing factors included not having enough targeted focus for math, especially for the Lowest 25th Percentile. We did not utilize the same strategies that we used for ELA, like Response to Intervention (RtI) and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in our ESSA Subgroup (Black/African American students) with Math Achievement declining from 43% in 2018 to 21% in 2019, a 22% decrease. Factors that contributed to this included ensuring i-Ready instruction was prioritized in reading more often over math. Learning gaps in math were not addressed as frequently, or as heavily, because reading was our priority focus.

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.

The greatest gap when comparing FSA data to the state average showed a significant difference in Math Achievement, both in the Lowest 25th Percentile and in achieving at least a level 3 across the school. Our overall Math Achievement was 59%, as compared to 63% at the state level, which is a

4% decrease. 47% of Lowest 25th Percentile made learning gains, while 51% of these students made learning gains statewide, which is a 4% decrease in comparison.

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

The most improvement was clearly shown in our ELA FSA data. In ELA, 26% of the Lowest 25th Percentile made learning gains in 2018 and this increased to 63% in 2019, which shows a 37% increase. Title I funds were used to purchase i-Ready instruction software and LLI materials. Additional support was provided by a Title I teacher and 2 assistants using LLI materials to serve students with the greatest ELA needs. The Lowest 25th Percentile population was monitored using i-Ready diagnostic and growth monitoring assessments.

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

The Early Warning Systems data shows that our 2 potential areas of concern are "Attendance Below 90%" and sixth grade "Level 1 on statewide assessment."

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

1. Students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 need to improve FSA Math Achievement level 3+ on the Spring Math FSA.
2. Students in our ESSA subgroup (Black/African American Students) need to improve FSA ELA and Math Achievement.
3. Students in grade 5 need to improve Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) Achievement by scoring a Level 3 or higher. Students in grades 3 and 4 will take district science assessments to determine learning gaps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	FSA data showed that only 47% of our Lowest 25% population made learning gains on the Math FSA in 2019, compared to the state average of 51%. Additionally, our Math FSA data indicated only 59% of students achieved a Level 3 or above when compared to the state at 63%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Lowest 25% population who make learning gains will increase from 47% to 52% on the Spring 2020 Math FSA. The percentage of students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 who achieve a Level 3 or above on the Spring 2020 Math FSA will increase from 59% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Norma Hostetler (hostetler.norma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	In order to achieve this goal, we will direct our i-Ready focus on math throughout the year. We will ensure that the teachers are using the online program with fidelity by hosting multiple trainings led by i-Ready representatives. Teachers will analyze i-Ready data and use resources available within i-Ready. Additionally, we will utilize our purchase of Ready workbooks in daily classroom instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By using the i-Ready program, teachers are held responsible for knowing exactly where students are struggling and are given resources to help them. Weekly lessons are monitored and teachers ensure that students are on track to fill in their learning gaps. i-Ready diagnostic provides teachers 3 snapshots of student progress towards proficiency of math standards and clear up misconceptions. By using Ready workbooks as a supplement to curriculum, students are presented with questions in a similar format of FSA.
Action Step	
Description	1. i-Ready training sessions hosted by i-Ready representative will be arranged. 2. Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic test data (fall, winter, and spring) and progress monitor math i-Ready lesson success (weekly). 3. Ready workbooks and Teacher Toolbox will be utilized in daily classroom instruction and math intervention, as evidenced in lesson plans and walk-throughs. 4. Incentives will be created for students to succeed on i-Ready math lessons. One example includes the "Weekly i-Ready Champion" board, which displays 1 champion for reading and math in every class, as well as the pass rate for each classroom. Teachers are also utilizing punch cards, in which students may earn a classroom reward after passing a certain number of lessons, determined by the teacher based on the grade level. 5. Communicate clear expectations of math curriculum pacing and instruction to all teachers during Teacher Administrator Coach (TAC) collaboration meetings.
Person Responsible	Manuela Moffitt (moffitt.manuela@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Achievement Gap of African American Subgroup
Rationale	In 2019, the Federal Index for our Black/African American students was 40%, below the 41% limit. In this student population, 21% of students achieved 3+ on the Math FSA, as compared to 43% the previous year. Math learning gains for the lowest 25% population increased from 35% to 43%; however, math learning gains overall in this subgroup decreased from 44% to 39%. ELA achievement in 2019 (39%) decreased from 2018 (44%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, math achievement 3+ of African American students will increase from 21% to 34%. ELA achievement will increase from 39% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Norma Hostetler (hostetler.norma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Members of Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups will be assigned students from the African American subgroup to participate in our mentor program. This will include tracking data on the students and checking in with them on a regular basis. Teachers will also meet once a month in their PLC groups to discuss the progress of the student and find solutions to struggles the students may be having. LLI program will be used to screen students' reading level and fill in learning gaps. To address our Math gap, we will track the ESSA subgroup's Math i-Ready progress throughout the year and analyze areas of improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The learning gains of the Lowest 25% increased from 6% to 54% last year. We utilized the PLC mentor strategy with our Lowest 25%, so we should see improvement in the Black/African American subgroup overall if we implement it again with the whole population of this subgroup. By giving students an opportunity to talk to an adult who they do not normally engage with on a daily basis in a lower stress environment (ex. playground or cafeteria), there is a great chance that they will open up about their needs and give more effort when they know that another adult in their life cares about their achievement. Both the LLI program and Math i-Ready showed substantial gains on our Lowest 25% population and we would like to use our resources available to show the same gains in our ESSA population.

Action Step	
Description	1. Math and Reading i-Ready data will be progress monitored for students in this subgroup at monthly MTSS meetings. 2. Students in the ESSA subgroup will be screened for LLI level and use that information to provide interventions accordingly. 3. Students in this subgroup will be assigned to members of PLC groups and monitor progress on a monthly basis to discuss achievements and areas of improvement, as well as collaborate on helpful strategies for these students. 4. Teaching strategies will be discussed to use with the ELA and Math curriculum at monthly TAC meetings.
Person Responsible	Linette Lochner (lochner.linette@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	In 2019, Science proficiency 3+ (58%) in fifth grade did not increase from our 2018 achievement (58%).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In the 2019-2020 school year, fifth grade students showing Science proficiency 3+ will increase from 58% to 63%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Norma Hostetler (hostetler.norma@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	In 2019-2020, fifth grade was departmentalized by assigning one science teacher for multiple classes, with one self-contained classroom. These teachers will utilize county-created lesson plans and formative and summative assessments to fully prepare students for the Science Standards Assessment. Third and fourth grade teachers will use county-created lesson plans and formative and summative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By allowing a teacher to instruct 4 science classes, she will be able to teach material and conduct meaningful science experiments with fidelity. The self-contained classroom teacher will collaborate with the science teacher and students will experience similar curriculum implementation across the grade level. Third and fourth grade assessment data will be progress monitored to identify learning gaps and clear up misconceptions.

Action Step	
Description	1. Dedicated fifth grade science lab will be created. 2. STEMScopes, county-created lesson plans, and corresponding science experiments in designated science lab with fidelity will be utilized. 3. Fifth grade student achievement on county-created science assessments will be analyzed and science curriculum implementation will be discussed during Teacher Administrator Coach (TAC) meetings (monthly). 4. Proficiency of student scores on county-created formative and summative assessments in third, fourth, and fifth grade will be monitored. 5. Third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers will collaborate concerning student learning gaps in science. 6. Parent participation and student interest will be encouraged through the use of STEAM nights, Science Fair support meetings, and science-based field trips such as "A Day in the Life of the Indian River Lagoon" and "Lagoon Quest". 5th and 6th graders will be able to participate in a STEM club, in which students will participate in activities such as drone operation, solar oven experiments, and more.
Person Responsible	Charity Kirkbride (kirkbride.charity@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).