Brevard Public Schools

South Lake Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

https://www.brevardschools.org/southlakees

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Brockwell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	33%
2019-20 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	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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.

Table of Contents

South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

https://www.brevardschools.org/southlakees

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 KG-6	No	35%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A

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.

Our school community empowers students to become self-motivated lifelong learners, intuitive problem-solving citizens who are future ready. Through engaging project-based learning, students are motivated to explore and experience Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics. Our goal is to ignite the passion of learning so that students discover their inner champion while ensuring future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to engage, inspire, and empower a community of learners in collaborating, innovating, and preparing them for future readiness.

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
Brockwell, Jennifer	Principal	The Principal will engage stakeholders through the School Advisory Council; be a data and instructional leader; provide leadership in the school improvement process; ensure that writing is done with consistency across grade levels; continue providing support to the Project Based Learning Process; view early warning indicators and continue to find ways to close achievement gaps; collaborate and progress monitor with teachers when viewing student data and instruction; conduct professional development to meet the needs of our teachers; monitor i-Ready usage reports; monitor the CARES Act funding/budget; and continue to lead the school with excellence. The principal will also continue to lead the school through a "Blended Learning Model" to ensure success in the event that we have instruction in a digital remote format. brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org
Shiffrin, Courtney	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will look at data to help make instructional decisions; continue to monitor the below grade level spreadsheets and help to provide teachers with interventions; continue to be a data and instructional leader and collaborate in the school's decision making process; coordinate differentiated professional development; be a support to teachers; support with curriculum needs; and monitor the academic support program. The AP will also have access to the Google Classroom platforms for every class in the event that we need to communicate in a remote digital platform. The AP will be a resource to help with technological needs and support to our substitute teachers. shiffrin.courtney@brevardschools.org
Jeffrey, Joyce	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach will support teachers in the implementation of the school-wide writing expectations; pull subgroup data and meet with the leadership team to address individual needs; review writing samples with the South Lake writing committee and give effective feedback; after reviewing samples of writing and looking at the data comes up with instructional next steps; data leader; participate in grade level meetings to support planning; participate in collaborative grade level meetings; support teachers; support in the implementation of the Brevard lesson available by quarter chart; support i-Ready standards mastery; and continue delivering professional development opportunities based on the School Improvement Plan needs. The literacy coach will ensure that she is able to support a class on the digital remote side in the event that she is needed to support the classroom teacher. jeffrey.joyce@brevardschools.org

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Jennifer Brockwell

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.*

3

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	33%
2019-20 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	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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.	

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	52	54	53	55	66	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	4	7	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/25/2020

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	54	53	54	55	45	47	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	6	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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	54	53	54	55	45	47	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	6	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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
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	69%	62%	57%	0%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	58%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	57%	53%	0%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	67%	63%	63%	0%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	65%	62%	0%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	53%	51%	0%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	57%	53%	0%	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	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		66%				
05	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		50%				
06	2019	72%	60%	12%	54%	18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		67%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		68%				
06	2019	54%	67%	-13%	55%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
	2018					
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	50	57	50	55	61	55					
BLK	92	60		25	40						
HSP	67	80		80	90						
WHT	66	54	53	70	58	58	58				
FRL	68	71	69	63	69	67	54				
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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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

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	54
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	79
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	66
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.

Pre-COVID: Our ELA learning gains showed the lowest performance in grades 4-6. South Lake Elementary 59%, District 60%, and State 58%.
Subgroups - 25% of Black/African American students were proficient on the math FSA and only 40% of Black/African American students had math learning gains on the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment.
(Data input from our SIP 2019-2020)

When analyzing the data for 2 quarters (start of the 2019 school-year and fall) we did note the following below:
I-Ready Reading – On grade level data
Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K – 57%/83% +26
1 – 25%/69% +44
2 – 41%/76% +35
3 – 78%/91% +13
4 – 69%/69% ***
5 – 52%/65% +13
6 – 36%/59% +23

I-Ready Math – On grade level data
Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K – 48%/77% +29
1 – 15%/59% +44

2 – 28%/48% +20
3 – 36%/76% +30
4 – 40%/64% +24
5 – 34%/72% +38
6 – 42%/40% -2 ***

Post-COVID: 9/2020
Diagnostic 1 - ELA/Math - On grade level data
K - N/A / N/A
1 - 22% ELA/24% Math
2 - 44% ELA/18% Math
3 - 75% ELA/26% Math
4 - 61% ELA/31% Math
5 - 71% ELA/51% Math
6 - 51% ELA/33% Math

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

South Lake Elementary reopened 2018-2019 and scored an "A" - 63 points which is the only FSA data we have since the reopening.

When analyzing the data for 2 quarters (start of 2019 and fall) we did note that first grade had the greatest growth. As we move into brick and mortar and working with eLearning students, we are concerned about the decline that happened due to distance learning in the spring and in combination with the summer slide. Our students in 1st and 4th grade have shown the biggest decline in looking at the data from returning to the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

Pre-COVID: South Lake Elementary 60%, District 65%, and state 62% in Math Learning Gains. This data was collected from the first year of reopening South Lake. Teachers were hired from all different schools in Brevard and some of the schools were using Eureka math programs and other schools were using different math programs. In reviewing the data for 2 quarters in 2019-2020 school-year, it was noted that our 6th grade math greatly struggled compared to state average. When reviewing Diagnostic one in math (9/2020), we have concerns in grades K-6.

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

Pre-COVID: When reviewing the data from the start of 2019-2020 to the start of the last 9-weeks of distance learning, the most improvement was in the following areas below:

I-Ready Reading – On grade level data
Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K – 57%/83% +26
1 – 25%/69% +44 ***
2 – 41%/76% +35
3 – 78%/91% +13
4 – 69%/69%
5 – 52%/65% +13
6 – 36%/59% +23
Actions took: We focused on a school-wide writing plan and we believe that helped many areas. We

also know that Standards Mastery helped to pinpoint areas of concern and reteaching those standards helped to close gaps.

I-Ready Math – On grade level data
Diagnostic 1/Diagnostic 2
K – 48%/77% +29
1 – 15%/59% +44 ***
2 – 28%/48% +20
3 – 36%/76% +30
4 – 40%/64% +24
5 – 34%/72% +38
6 – 42%/40% -2
Actions took: We made some changes in the 6th grade team and departmentalization content areas. We also had professional development support with math which contributed to the growth in other areas.

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

Attendance - we currently meet monthly to discuss attendance and make personal calls to families when they have more than 3 unexcused absences. Due to the COVID requirements in sending students home more frequently, and may not return until they have a doctors note or a negative COVID test and fever free for 24 hours without meds, it is very important that there is solid communication between the student going home and the work that must continue. We have a process in place for notifications and the teacher communicates with the families on next steps. The front office clerk notifies the principal of students that have missed more than 3 consecutive days. We also have reviewed the early warning data and identified several students that are new to South Lake with gaps in their academics and steps to gain the help that is needed. We have referred them to our Child Study Team and have met with teachers to discuss next steps.

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

1. Writing with consistency across grade levels and in all subject areas.
2. Continuing with Project Based Learning in all classrooms.
3. Closing Achievement Gaps - tracking data from i-Ready diagnostic, running records, DIBELS, DORF, PASI/PSI, standards mastery, KLS/FLKRS, and review early warning indicators every 9-weeks

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We want to continue what we discovered when analyzing the ELA FSA data from the 2018-2019 school year, only 17% of South Lake students in grades 4-6 showed mastery (level 3+) in text based writing. This area of focus impacts student learning and success because students need to be able to express their knowledge and understanding through writing across the content areas. Additional ELA FSA data for 2018-2019: Craft and Structure - 31% proficient Integration of Knowledge and Ideas - 12% proficient Key Ideas and Details - 19% proficient Language and Editing -75% proficient
Measurable Outcome:	South Lake students in grades 4-6 will increase the ELA FSA text based writing proficiency levels by at least 10% increasing from 17% to 27% of those that show mastery (level +3) of the standards in text based writing on the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Purpose, Focus, and Organization - In this domain, students are expected to write a response that is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task. It should have clearly stated controlling idea/opinion and effective organizational structure creating coherence and completeness. Evidence and Elaboration - In this domain, students are expected to write a response that provides thorough and convincing support with cited evidence for the controlling idea/writer's claim that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. Conventions of Standard English - In this domain, students are expected to write a response that demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. The response may include some minor errors in usage, but no patterns of errors. It should include adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In reviewing the data, 83% of South Lake students in grades 4-6 did not show proficiency on the text based writing portion of the FSA ELA. As a resource we will use the Department of Education rubrics, writing samples, templates, lessons, and suggestions to instruct and progress monitor our students. We are concerned because our students scored high on the 3rd grade ELA FSA assessment. We identify a "writing need" in grades K-6 and when they arrive to 4th grade and take the writing portion on the FSA, we will not see the learning gains needed due to the inconsistency with their writing. We believe the problem is that students came from a variety of schools, teachers came from a variety of schools, and the expectations varied greatly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue using Backward Design to Help All Students Write Effectively book for all teachers and administration.
2. South Lake Writing Committee will meet to review what we covered prior to COVID and next steps for our school to continue a strong writing plan.
3. Professional Development with teachers on strategies to implement with opportunities for collaboration and feedback.
4. Collaboration/Progress Monitoring of student data/instruction - The writing committee will meet every month to look at grade level writing samples and review our K-6 writing plan specific to South Lake Elementary.
5. Black/African American students are a subgroup below 41% and South Lake will focus on providing

supports for our students. Activity teachers will "push in" to support, review, and give feedback on students writing samples.

6. Literacy Coach will participate in common planning with grade level teams focused on incorporation of text-based writing strategies in unit plans.

Person Responsible   Joyce Jeffrey (jeffrey.joyce@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Early Warning Indicators show a need for South Lake to focus on students attendance and also students that scored a level 1 on the ELA and/or Math Florida Standards Assessments. We believe that PBL (Project Based Learning) is an integral key for increasing student success and long-term growth. The combination of collaboration, reflection, and individual decision-making gives the students an applicable scenario to real-world situations that they will face as they mature. School becomes much more engaging through the active participation in projects that focus on real-world issues rather than passively attending classes. Furthermore, PBL provides content and skills that students can actively apply in future life events and situations. We believe that projects developed by PBL methods are empowering students and teachers to make a real difference.
Measurable Outcome:	For the year 2018-2019, we have 29 students with attendance below 90% and 27 scores of level 1 on the ELA and/or Math statewide assessment. For the 2020-2021 school-year, our goal will be 15 students with attendance below 90% and only 14 scores of level 1 on the ELA and/or Math statewide assessment in grades 3-6.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Project Based Learning is a teaching method in which students gain knowledge and skills by working for an extended period of time to investigate and respond to an authentic, engaging, and complex question, problem, or challenge. Teachers will conduct at least one PBL every 9-weeks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	South Lake reopening is with a focus on STEAM - Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics. During the pandemic we do not want to lose this focus and it will be very challenging to be able to engage our students in our vision and mission. When reviewing the early warning systems, we know there is a need to keep our students engaged to improve attendance and the desire to engage in school. We also know there is a fine balance for students to not come to school sick but we believe that when students are engaged in the work and know there is a purpose for them with real-world applications, they will apply more to their educational needs and outcome. We have a total of 12 students with two or more indicators and our goal is to decrease this for future graduation success.

Action Steps to Implement	

Project Based Learning involves real world experiences and applications. Our families are offered volunteer opportunities (via digital platform) to speak to our students for career day or any day that is scheduled; for example, Kennedy Space Center information, dental, medical, engineering, business owners, health and fitness, safety, and many other opportunities for students to link education to the "why" in real-world situations.

Person Responsible	Courtney Shiffrin (shiffrin.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Professional Development - teachers will volunteer to share their Projects Based Learning at faculty meetings. Teachers will document their Project Based Learning activity to the "Brevard lessons available by quarter" chart every 9-weeks. South Lake will utilize the curriculum provided through ATU's, DBQ's, CIS lessons, Text Sets, and teacher created materials.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Black/African American Students are a subgroup below 41% and South Lake will focus on providing supports for our students. We will focus on providing engaging math strategies through opportunities in Project Based Learning and the invitation to our Academic Support Program.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	South Lake will use the early warning systems and ESSA data to help close achievement gaps for the 2020-2021 school year. We know the importance of knowing exactly what students know and are able to do. When reviewing the data from i-Ready diagnostic assessment, it showed the decline in learning from students being out last spring/distance learning and also the summer slide. We were also able to identify students with many early warning indictors that we can address.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2018-2019 FSA Mathematics percentage of level 3 students for black students will increase from 31% to 42% on the 2020-2021 FSA Mathematic assessment. An attainable goal for South Lake growth on the i-Ready diagnostic from initial to window 3 will be the following: ELA will increase from 54% in Tier 1 to 65% in Tier 1. Math will increase from 30% in Tier 1 to 50% in Tier 1.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TNTP best practices - Scaffolding Strategies BPS Elementary Leading and Learning Instructional Agreements 2020-2021
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A key recommendation from TNTP research findings is to give all students greater access to grade-level assignments. How do we support ALL students to be successful with the rigorous grade-appropriate content that we know is so important for their academic outcomes? We will focus on scaffolding strategies to address that need. Instead of simplifying activities and bringing content down to what students can currently do, scaffolding up focuses on getting students to master the key practices and concepts in grade-level content, with students able to do so increasingly independently over time.

Action Steps to Implement

Review the Early Warning Systems Data in Performance Matters and the created below grade level spreadsheet during all grade level data team meetings. Help to track these students and monitor the growth.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Work with grade level teams to identify the standards to be assessed and help support teachers in collecting that data and building groups to address the needs. We need to ensure that teachers are using the Standards Mastery i-Ready data to drive instruction and close gaps. Help teacher choose 2 priority standards to assess (Form A) within each 9 weeks. Help plan small group instruction and re-teach the focus standard using lessons from the Teacher's Toolbox in i-Ready. Monitor that teachers re-assess students with low or partial mastery on the focus standard(s) utilizing Standards Mastery Assessments (Form B). Provide Professional Development based on needs "coaching cycle" to help teachers with implementation and looking at data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible	Joyce Jeffrey (jeffrey.joyce@brevardschools.org)

Principal and AP may include some of the following steps during their informal and formal observations. This will help to close achievement gaps with other strategies that we have in place. Emphasis on grade level standards; no skills taught in isolation; rigorous writing tasks in response to reading; scaffolding strategies to support ALL students access to grade level work; utilization and keeping pace of the

standards focus documents; utilize standards mastery as a formative tool to drive instruction; protect intervention time and personnel so that interventions take place daily.

Person Responsible Courtney Shiffrin (shiffrin.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Identify Black African-American students that struggle in math and help support the teacher in finding additional strategies through the i-Ready curriculum that we have access to. Help teachers strategically prioritize remediation of the content that matters most for success in later mathematics (versus attempting to address all gaps students have or spending the most time on areas where student performance is weakest). When students' unfinished learning does not prevent them from engaging with grade-level content, integrate remediation support into regular instruction. Help teachers to differentiate math content and scaffolds for students based on individual or small group remediation needs. Provide new experience for students to re-engage with previously taught content (versus reteaching using methods and strategies students were not successful with before.)

Person Responsible Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

*Academic Support Program - We will utilize the funds for students in grades 3 that are substantially deficient in ELA and mathematics; students in grades 3-6 that are substantially deficient or deficient in ELA, mathematics, or science. (Amount for ASP $2,748.73) COVID additional funds - we were granted an additional ($2,451.60). Students were identified from the i-Ready data in reading/math and will review the SSA part 1 to see what skills 5th grade students are missing in previous years in science. The students we are going to focus on are in grades 3-6.

*Collaboration and Mutual Accountability - Teams of South Lake teachers have analyzed data to identify students performing at the lowest 25%. Teachers are aware that CMA teams purposes are to collaborate with colleagues in a positive manner to promote student learning and school wide success through team effort, vertical and horizontal articulation and common assessments. The activity teachers help to support grade levels at South Lake but they also collaborate with other activity teachers in the district, as long as, there are at least three members on the team.

*Data Team Meetings/Grade Level Meetings - Teachers meet throughout the year for data team meetings with administration, guidance, and the school's literacy coach to analyze data and plan instruction based on the needs of students and their proficiency levels relative to the standards being assessed. Interventions leading to proficiency are put in place and monitored for each struggling student. We also have a MTSS Leadership team that meets to develop intervention plans to assist with academic and/or behavioral concerns. The Leadership Team provides valuable input after reviewing IPST paperwork, conversing with the teacher, and reviewing the data collected to determine if new strategies should be applied, and/or if different interventions should be implemented.

*Prior to COVID a walk to Intervention Model was implemented at South Lake daily to assist those students struggling in reading and math. However, due to COVID, teachers will need to monitor progress on a daily basis and also interpret the data from an assessment that is provided approximately every four weeks. Students who do not show adequate progress may receive additional interventions, as well as, be brought before the IPST committee. South Lake is fortunate to utilize our activity teachers for at least 75 minutes a day to help support the lowest 25% of students. They push-in to classrooms and provide additional hands-on support to build that confidence in students.

*South Lake is very fortunate to have a very active PTO (Parent-Teacher Organization) and also a very active SAC (School Advisory Council). Being a non-Title 1 school, we have a lot of communication with all stakeholders, including several business partners which help support our school in a variety of ways. Due to COVID, we are holding all meetings virtually and volunteer hours have been suspended until further notice.

*School Safety - School Safety is our number one priority and we take great pride in a continuous cycle of understanding, practicing of drills, and ensuring that our faculty and students are safe. We also start each and every faculty meeting with questions about safety and address any concerns.

*Social Skills - South Lake will continue to use the STEAM expectations school-wide (self-discipline, trustworthiness, excellence, ambition, and manners). Teachers will also have access to Sanford Harmony for tips and tools to use in their classroom. We also started and will continue during Professional Development training on "Trauma Awareness" to help our students have their basic needs met so that they can learn better.

*Go over the "Strategic Plan 2020-25" to all stakeholders - Kindergarten Readiness - South Lake will monitor our early literacy skills, exposure to mathematics concepts, self-regulation, and social skills are key to kindergarten readiness. Algebra 1 Success - we will ensure that our math

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.

Insight Survey Data – The instructional culture Index is a summary measure of a school's instructional culture.

South Lake School Index Score for the 2019-2020 school year was 9.7
South Lake School Index Percentile Rank is 95%

Here are the top three areas for South Lake Elementary

School Operations 9.7, 6.1, 7.5 (Winter 2019, Brevard Average, Brevard Top-Quartile)
Instructional Planning 9.3, 5.9, 7.6
for Student Growth
Peer Culture 9.2, 6.3, 7.9

Here are some areas for South Lake on which we will reflect and build upon:

Leadership 8.4, 6.7, 7.4 (Winter 2019, Brevard Average, Brevard Top-Quartile) *We will give quality feedback to teachers and also seek out feedback from teachers.
Academic Opportunity 8.5, 6.3, 7.7 *We will refer to the Standards Focus Documents during grade level meetings; ensuring teachers know what resources are available.

Youth Truth Survey Data - We had our teachers review the data and reflect on what is something your grade level can change and also what is something they can celebrate. Some of the key points that students brought up in the survey will be reviewed "your voice has been heard" on the morning announcements.

Our percentile ranks for grades 3-6 were the following:
Engagement - 34th percentile out of 100th
Academic Rigor - 36th percentile
Relationships - 14th percentile (one specific grade level impacted this greatly and changes have been made)
Culture - 69th percentile
Instructional Methods - 31st percentile
We were able to identify a grade level (6th grade) and hone in on some of the instructional issues for both the academic areas and the social/emotional for our students.

Parent Survey Data -

Here are just a few areas that we found valuable in making decisions from our parent survey data:
Families responded that Monday - Friday evenings are the best time for them to attend a school event.

Which of the following informational meetings and activities would you participate in or attend? Top three choices were family fun nights, volunteer opportunities, and math strategies.

What types of family engagement resources would you see if they were provided at your school? Academic support, technology resources, and workshops on how to manage behaviors at home were the top selections.

How could your school assist you in playing a more active role in school decision-making? The top three selections were convenient meeting times, more information about school issues to be addressed, and more information on how to become engaged.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.
South Lake takes pride on constantly reflecting on how to address building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved. We reflect on survey data and make decisions based on the feedback from all stakeholders; teachers, support staff, parents, students, and community members. We conduct monthly PTO and SAC meetings to ensure that voices are heard.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00