

Brevard Public Schools

# South Lake Elementary



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

<https://www.brevardschools.org/southlakees>

### Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Brockwell**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

<https://www.brevardschools.org/southlakees>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	No	36%
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	2020-21	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	Position 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; 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; and continue to lead the school with excellence.
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.
Coulson, Liana	Reading Coach	The literacy coach will support teachers with implementing the new ELA curriculum and expectations; data leader; participate in grade level meetings to support ELA planning; support teachers; support teachers with implementation of a school wide intervention; support i-Ready and i-Ready standards mastery; and continue delivering professional development opportunities based on the School Improvement Plan needs. Help support teachers with the MTSS process. Support teachers through classroom walkthroughs and give feedback.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/19/2021, 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**

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

396

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

6

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

7

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

**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	54	55	54	54	67	66	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	3	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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**

Wednesday 8/18/2021

**2020-21 - 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	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	

**2020-21 - 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	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	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				69%	62%	57%		60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	60%	58%		54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	57%	53%		46%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	63%	63%		62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	65%	62%		59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	53%	51%		49%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	57%	53%		57%	55%

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-ready (end of year view)  
Science SSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52/71%	52/81%	52/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/75%	16/75%	16/94%
	Students With Disabilities	12/58%	12/58%	12/83%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/41%	51/55%	52/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/60%	16/69%	16/88%
	Students With Disabilities	12/25%	12/42%	12/58%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54/22%	54/50%	54/85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/32%	19/47%	19/84%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18%	11/36%	11/55%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54/24%	54/54%	54/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/21%	19/74%	19/68%
	Students With Disabilities	11/27%	11/45%	11/55%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/40%	54/65%	54/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/41%	24/54%	24/79%
	Students With Disabilities	7/0%	7/14%	7/14%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/13%	54/46%	54/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/58%	24/46%	24/58%
	Students With Disabilities	6/17%	7/14%	7/29%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/72%	64/88%	63/92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/56%	32/84%	31/90%
	Students With Disabilities	13/38%	12/42%	12/75%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/25%	64/42%	63/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/22%	32/31%	31/81%
	Students With Disabilities	13/15%	12/83%	12/58%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/64%	61/79%	61/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/52%	21/76%	21/71%
	Students With Disabilities	7/43%	7/43%	7/71%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60/30%	61/59%	61/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/19%	21/52%	21/76%
	Students With Disabilities	7/14%	7/43%	7/71%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			41/88%
	Economically Disadvantaged			20/85%
	Students With Disabilities			14/86%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43/67%	43/79%	43/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/65%	20/70%	20/80%
	Students With Disabilities	14/43%	14/57%	14/64%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43/47%	43/63%	42/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/50%	20/55%	19/68%
	Students With Disabilities	14/36%	14/50%	14/64%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

## Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	58	70	60	55	70	55	77				
BLK	60			70							
HSP	92			83							
MUL	77			69							
WHT	78	80	71	79	79	61	90				
FRL	72	82	69	69	68	50	84				
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

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
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	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	88
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	77
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	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Looking at our i-Ready data for the 2020-2021 school year we noticed the following trends:

1st Grade ELA Fall - 71%; Winter - 81%; Spring - 96%  
 2nd Grade ELA Fall - 22%; Winter - 50%; Spring - 85%  
 2nd Grade Math Fall - 24%; Winter - 54%; Spring - 87%  
 3rd Grade ELA: Fall - 40%; Winter - 65%; Spring - 79%  
 3rd Grade Math Fall - 13%; Winter - 46%; Spring - 69%  
 4th Grade ELA Fall - 72%; Winter - 88%; Spring - 92%  
 4th Grade Math Fall - 25%; Winter - 42%; Spring - 83%  
 5th Grade ELA Fall - 64%; Winter - 79%; Spring - 82%  
 5th Grade Math Fall - 30%; Winter - 59%; Spring 84%  
 6th Grade ELA Fall - 67%; Winter - 79%; Spring 84%  
 6th Grade Math Fall - 47%; Winter - 63%; Spring - 79%

Subgroups - Students with Disabilities

2nd Grade ELA Fall - 18%; Winter - 36%; Spring - 55%  
 4th Grade ELA Fall - 38%; Winter - 42%; Spring - 75%  
 6th Grade ELA Fall - 43%; Winter - 57%; Spring - 64%  
 1st Grade Math Fall - 25%; Winter - 42%; Spring - 58%  
 2nd Grade Math Fall - 27%; Winter - 45%; Spring - 55%  
 5th Grade Math Fall - 14%; Winter- 43%; Spring - 71%  
 6th Grade Math Fall - 36%; Winter - 50%; Spring - 64%

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Subgroups - 25% of Black/African American students were proficient on the Math Florida Standards Assessment and only 40% of Black/African American students had made Math learning gains on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment.

When analyzing the i-ready data for the fall, winter and spring for the 2020 school year we noticed the following areas of needs of improvement:

3rd Grade ELA SWD: Fall - 0%; Winter - 14%; Spring - 14%  
 3rd Grade Math SWD: Fall - 17%; Winter 14%; Spring - 29%

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

Due to Covid some of our students were e-learning and the ESE teacher was trying to juggle those students who were doing online learning and students in the brick and mortar classroom. We still have a concern for the new actions to be taken to address this need for improvement because we still have students who are quarantined and e-learning isn't an option this year. We are monitoring and tracking those students who are missing their IEP minutes due to being quarantined and making sure those students are getting their minutes met so there is no instructional loss.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Looking at our i-Ready data 2nd grade ELA and 2nd grade Math showed the most improvement. Also, our 4th grade and 5th grade Math showed improvement from Fall to Spring.  
 2nd Grade ELA Fall - 22%; Winter - 50%; Spring - 85%  
 2nd Grade Math Fall - 24%; Winter - 54%; Spring - 87%  
 4th Grade Math Fall - 25%; Winter - 42%; Spring - 83%  
 5th Grade Math Fall - 30%; Winter - 59%; Spring 84%  
 On the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment our over all ELA Achievement was 69%. The district average was 62% and the state average was 57%.

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

The contributing factors we feel helped with this improvement was we made sure that all teachers had their full 60 minutes for Math instruction. Our teachers followed the Eureka curriculum with fidelity.

The administration team monitored i-Ready minutes to make sure all students were meeting their minutes weekly. Teachers were notified if they had any students who didn't meet their minutes.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate the learning is the Academic Support Program for ELA, Math and Science. Admin will also need to ensure that the BEST Standards are taught to the depth of the standard and grade level materials are utilized.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional Development opportunities we will offer at the school to support teachers and leaders is looking at the BEST Standards for ELA. We will dive deeper into the new ELA curriculum for K-5th and 6th grade. We will use the Math Resource Teacher to reinforce the Mathematical Practices for Mathematics. We will have i-Ready training to pull the pre-requisite reports to train the teachers to differentiate in Math.

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

The administration team has built in time for a school wide ELA Intervention block where additional teachers (activity teachers) support is provided to help support the teachers. The administration team has also built in time for Social Emotional Learning. The administration team will monitor the school wide ELA intervention block and the Social Emotional Learning time by walking the classes.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	After analyzing the i-Ready data for the fall, winter and spring for the 2020 school year we noticed that our student with disabilities scored lower than our general education students.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is 50% of our SWD student will score 70% or higher by the spring ELA and Mathematics i-Ready diagnostics.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The administration/literacy coach will monitor the i-Ready diagnostic scores to see areas of improvement. Students will be placed in intervention groups which will be monitored with fidelity. The administration/literacy coach will monitor 3rd-6th grade Standards Mastery scores and use the information to drive instruction and small group instruction.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Within the high support environment we are utilizing evidence based strategies of collaborative teaching, interventions provided within the general education classroom, and additional small group direct instruction. We are also engaging in Professional Development to ensure that teachers are receiving materials to help improve students instruction based on students' specific needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Our students with disabilities have many gaps compared to their general education peers. By individualizing their instruction with properly vetted materials we will start to see gaps being closed and students more successful with Tier 1 instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Literacy Coach will provide Professional Development

**Person Responsible** Liana Coulson (coulson.liana@brevardschools.org)

Literacy Coach will monitor i-ready diagnostics and standards Mastery to work with teachers to build their Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups.

**Person Responsible** Liana Coulson (coulson.liana@brevardschools.org)

Administration will monitor below grade level spreadsheets and school wide interventions data.

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

Administration will monitor below grade level spreadsheets and school wide interventions data.

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

Academic Support Program will be offered to students in 3rd-6th grade after school.

Those students who will have the opportunity to attend ASP include:

- \* Grade 3-6 students that are substantially deficient or deficient in ELA, Mathematics, Social Studies or Science
- \* Students whose attendance and performance was/is impacted due to Covid-19

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

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

Looking at our Youth Truth Survey our data shows that our school ranked 49th in students feeling that they belong.

This summary describes the degree which students feel welcome at their school

3rd grade 2.66 average rating

4th grade 2.55 average rating

5th grade 2.52 average rating

6th grade 2.48 average rating

This summary describes the degree which students have strong, supportive relationships with their teachers

3rd grade 2.80

4th grade 2.79

5th grade 2.68

6th grade 2.75

Do you feel like a real part of your school community?

School Average:

9% no, hardly ever

25% sometimes

66% yes, very often

**Area of  
Focus  
Description  
and  
Rationale:**

District Average:

15% no, hardly ever

29% sometimes

56% yes, very often

Grade Level Averages:

3rd Grade:

22% Sometimes

76% Yes, very often

4th Grade:

8% No, hardly ever

29% Sometimes

63% Yes, very often

5th Grade:

8% No, hardly ever

32% Sometimes

61% Yes, very often

6th Grade:

17% No, hardly ever

19% Sometimes

64% Yes, very often

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

100% of our teachers will fully implement Social Emotional Learning daily in their classroom. Currently 64% of our 6th graders feel a part of their community. We would like to improve to 75% of our 6th graders that feel like they belong in the school community.

**Monitoring:**

Administration will set up a school wide Social Emotional Learning time for teachers to implement during the day. Administration will do walk-throughs to make sure teachers are

teaching Social Emotional Lessons daily with fidelity. Administration will analyze the Youth Truth Survey results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will be engaged in Professional Development during preplanning to model how to teach SEL lessons in their classroom. Teachers will have opportunities to share during faculty meetings lessons that went very well in their classroom or things they have learned while working with their students. Teachers will continue year two training on conscious discipline. Conscious Discipline is an evidence-based, trauma-informed approach.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

After looking at the data and some of our students not feeling like they belong it shows that the school needed a school wide Social Emotional Learning time. Teachers will be trained on Sanford Harmony and how to implement in their classroom.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Implementing "A Caught Being Good" where students have an awareness of others actions and work with the school resource officer to share when positive things are happening in the school community.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Offering more student led opportunities where students are taking leadership roles and feeling a part of the school community. Example: School News, National Elementary Honor Society, etc.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**\*Discipline Data - Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, we compared the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and will monitor the following: After looking at the SafeschoolsforAlex.org we reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. We are ranked #1 out of 1,395 schools. Teachers will continue to provide Social Emotional Learning daily and follow our school wide STEAM (Self-discipline, Trustworthiness, Excellence, Ambition, Manners) expectations. We will also continue our mentorship program with the SRO and how he has impacted our students at South Lake.**

## 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.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2021-2022 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and a student survey called "youth truth". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

\* Our faculty insight survey included areas of strength which included:

Peer Culture-School Winter 2020 8.8, Brevard Average 6.5 and Brevard Top Quartile 7.8

Learning Environment- School Winter 2020 8.6, Brevard Average 6.1, Top Quartile 7.7

Leadership-School Winter 2020 8.4, Brevard Average 6.2, Top Quartile 7.7.

Target areas for improvement include:

Professional Development-School Winter 2020 6.7, Brevard Average 5.5, Top Quartile, 7.0

Observation and Feedback-School Winter 2020 7.7, Brevard Average 5.8 and Top Quartile 7.0

Using this trend data, resources will be provided at each faculty meeting and grade level meetings to add instructional tools for our staff. Staff will have opportunities to share teaching techniques at faculty meetings.

\* Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicates that we were only 44th in "Academic Challenge" and 49th in "Belonging". These focus areas will be addressed with the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising the level of rigor in daily instruction. Grade level meetings will include specific action analysis of these standards and ensure that items are being addressed.

\* The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories:

Feeling welcome at school (89% yes),

office staff at my school is polite and is helpful in answering questions or concerns (91% yes),

78% of our parents said yes they feel they have been given opportunities to provide input and feedback into school decisions.

Areas of improvement included:

Increase in parent/teacher communication, and more resources relating to classroom assistance (only 57% said they often communicate with parents).

Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Weekly parent academic resources will be sent with weekly updates to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with standards.



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

The school engages families, students, and all faculty members in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction. Our school takes pride in building positive relationships with many stakeholders. Our SAC and PTO meet monthly. We listen and make sure they all members have a voice and are listened to. We have built many relationships with local business partners who have helped to support our school.