

Brevard Public Schools

Lockmar Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Campione, Kathleen	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. The Leadership team meets on a weekly basis to analyze data, and discuss strategies of improvement.
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.
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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kathleen Campione A

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	73	94	82	115	71	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	12	13	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	6	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
4th Quarter Learning Loss	0	20	21	22	47	39	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	191

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	2	4	5	5	10	7	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	1	4	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/12/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(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	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				

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
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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	40
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	57
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	66
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	57
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.

1. Math Lowest 25% - 47%/District 53%/State 51%. Declined from 2018, below the district and state
 2. Math Achievement - 59%/District 63%/State 63% - Improved from 2018 but is lower than the state average
 3. Science – 58%/District 57%/State 53% - Stayed the same from 2018
 4. 3rd and 6th grade declined with overall Level 3 and higher in ELA from 2018 to 2019 (3rd – 2 and 6th -7)
 5. 3rd and 6th grade declined with overall Level 3 and higher in Math from 2018 to 2019 (3rd -4 and 6th -3)
 6. Our ESSA subgroup of black/African American students fell into the 40th percentile on the federal index.
 7. Students with disabilities and ESOL are at the 46th percentile on the federal index.
- We will be closely monitoring these two groups on monthly monitoring.

Math is a concern with a declining trend over the past three years where we are not performing at the district or state level. There has been improvements in the area of overall achievement but still not at the levels of district and state. However, further analysis show that currently, iReady math data indicates the concern with students showing a learning loss from Winter 2020 to Fall 2020. The grade level with the highest percentage of loss is in 5th grade.

Learning Loss on iReady in Math, Winter to Fall

- 1st 16/73 = 23%
- 2nd 17/94 = 18%
- 3rd 17/82 = 21%
- 4th 32/115 = 29%
- 5th 29/71 = 41%
- 6th 20/94 = 21%

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

The greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was in the area of ELA in 6th grade with the Level 3 or higher, going from 65% to 58%. A decline in the ESSA subgroup of Black/African American students in the areas of ELA, Math and Science have been identified as a trend.

The factors that have contributed to a decline in the area of ELA in 6th grade is potentially a culminating effect of standards complexity increase over the years.

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.

There are two areas that we are below the state average and that is Math Achievement level and Math Achievement Lowest 25%. These gaps are both at 4 percentage point differences. The focus of the school has been in ELA with professional development and daily schedule which has contributed to this gap in math.

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

The area that has shown the biggest improvement is ELA Learning Gains going from 47% to 70%. The focus has been on ELA with professional development and daily schedule. Teachers were held accountable to a positive 90 minute reading block structure. Observations and feedback was provided within the ELA block.

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

Attendance and Suspension have both increased from 2018 to 2019 school years. These would both be an area of concern.

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

1. Standards driven instruction focusing on math
2. Collaborative planning
3. Intervention Structure
4. Social Emotional needs focusing on behaviors and attendance
5. Monitoring under performing ESSA subgroups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data from discipline referrals, threat assessments and bully investigations forms indicate a need for school wide expectations and focus on behavioral interventions. Due to the COVID school closure in the spring of 2019-2020 school year, it is imperative to focus on the social emotional needs of our students.

Measurable Outcome: By May of 2021 there will be a decrease in student suspension, threat assessments and bully investigations by 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Long (long.melissa@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School wide focus on a research based character education program and small group Guidance groups for students who are identified.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Out of the 19 suspensions there were 8 students who were repeat offenders. A focus on a systemic school side approach will support a positive school environment. Additionally, the guidance groups will support these specific students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. One of our Guidance Counselors will be on the Activity Wheel to ensure we are touching as many students as possible with strategies for coping and providing researched based Character education.

Person Responsible Kristina Bradish (bradish.kristina@brevardschools.org)

2 Monitoring of student data, behavioral and social emotional data. Implementation of Behavioral data meetings will be each Monday.

Person Responsible Melissa Long (long.melissa@brevardschools.org)

3. Small Guidance groups will be formed with students in need of support in Guidance as well as a character developing group with a PE coach.

Person Responsible Kristina Bradish (bradish.kristina@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning Loss data collected based on i-Ready diagnostic from Winter 2020 to Fall 2020 indicates a learning loss of 31% of our population. An unplanned shut down at the end of the 2019-2020 lacked direct standards aligned instruction which attributed to the loss.
	By May of 2021, 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to participate in differentiated small groups during Tier 1 reading and math instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Common assessment (QLA, Standards Mastery and iReady Diagnostic) data in ELA will show 70% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment (Math quarterly and iReady Diagnostic) data in Math will show 70% of students performing at or above proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Manuela Moffitt (moffitt.manuela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly data meetings and Professional Learning Communities will be focused on standards aligned instructional practices, and analyzing data. The work of the data meeting will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions: 1. What is it we want our students to learn? 2. How will we know if each student has learned it? 3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it? 4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated?
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to provide students opportunities to engage in standards aligned instruction (whether face to face or eLearning), teachers will be supported through a structure for collaborative planning and data meetings that are focused on effective teaching methods.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of structures for Tier 1 reading and math blocks will be shared, monitored and implemented by all teachers.

Person Responsible Kathleen Campione (campione.kathleen@brevardschools.org)

2. Implementation of structures for Tier 2 and 3 interventions will be shared, monitored and implemented by all teachers.

Person Responsible Manuela Moffitt (moffitt.manuela@brevardschools.org)

3. Standards based instruction strategies will be a focus in professional development, monthly staff newsletters and walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Melissa Long (long.melissa@brevardschools.org)

4. Monthly monitoring of our ESSA subgroups, specifically black/African American. on iReady and classroom observations to ensure instructional strategies are effective with academic progress.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will monitor collaborative planning, participating in weekly planning with grade level teams. This will provide support to teachers and will assist in the determination of professional development topics. The team will also focus on providing a school wide focus on an MTSS structure. This structure will support students who have specific deficits gain support.

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.

Lockmar adopted a code of conduct for students called ARMOR. This is discussed, taught and emphasized throughout the school. Students are held to a high standard of behavior. Based on the Insight Survey, staff identified consistent behavior as an area of improvement. We have scheduled behavior focus meetings once a week and added the component of asking for teacher input on disciplinary consequence. Lockmar has a positive referral process for students, where any staff member can recognize a student. These student names are displayed in our common area and choose a prize. There is a recognition process for staff, where they write names on a STAR KNIGHT page. These staff members are rewarded with gifts at the faculty meeting. Our goal at Lockmar is to provide a safe, welcoming and inviting environment for all students, staff and community members. We have an active Business Partner program where we advertise and support them as well as they support our needs. Two local Churches have collaborated with Lockmar staff to do beautification projects.

Based on the parent survey tutoring is an area of concern. This year we plan to implement two tutoring options, one would be online and the other in person two days a week. Our focus area is in Math specifically inviting students who have been identified as needing extra support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.