

Brevard Public Schools

South Lake Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Brockwell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	No	33%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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 teacher; 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 to 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 continue to support teachers with implementing the ELA curriculum and expectations; data leader; participate in grade level meetings to support ELA planning; support teachers; support teachers with intervention; support i-Ready reading; and continue delivering professional development opportunities based on need. The literacy coach will help support teachers with the MTSS process and the new digital platform. She will support teachers through classroom walkthroughs and give specific feedback to help growth.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Jennifer Brockwell

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

435

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

3

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

6

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	55	54	54	67	66	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	12	10	7	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Monday 8/29/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	61%	56%				69%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	73%						59%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						60%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	76%	49%	50%				67%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						60%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						62%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	60%	59%				65%	57%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2022					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	44	53	50	41	45	33					
BLK	82			73							
HSP	81	67		81	67						
MUL	79	90		64	70						
WHT	78	72	61	77	63	53	87				
FRL	77	75	67	71	64	45	74				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

ESSA Federal Index	
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	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	78
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
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	70
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Looking at our Mathematics FSA data for the 2021-2022 school year we noticed the following trends:

72.8% Black/African Americans scored Level 3 or higher

81.4% Hispanics scored Level 3 or higher

64.3% Multiracial scored Level 3 or higher

76.9% White scored Level 3 or higher

70.8% Economically Disadvantaged Level 3 or higher

5% SWD scored a level 3 or higher

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

Looking at our Mathematics FSA data for the 2021-2022 school year we noticed the following trends:

18% Black/African Americans scored Level 1

9.1% Black/African Americans scored Level 2

6.3% Hispanics scored Level 1

12.5% Hispanics scored Level 2

21.4% Multiracial scored Level 1

14.3% Multiracial scored Level 2
12.2% White scored Level 1
11% White scored Level 2
18% Economically Disadvantaged Level 1
11.2% Economically Disadvantaged Level 2
7% SWD scored level 1 or 2

When analyzing the i-Ready data for the fall, winter and spring for the 2021 school year we noticed the following areas of needs of improvement:

5th grade Math SWD: Fall - 24%; Winter - 21%; Spring - 18%

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 it was still a concern with students being quarantined for 10 days for semester 1. Teachers were struggling with how to make-up the information for those students who were quarantined. Also, there was a new ELA program so we focused a lot on the new program and the ELA intervention schedule. We didn't put as much focus into Math and the math small group instruction.

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

Looking at our i-Ready data for ELA and Math we noticed the following most improvement:

ELA

At Risk for Tier 3

Window 1: 6% to Final Diagnostic 2%

Tier 2:

Window 1: 42% to Final Diagnostic 16%

Tier 1:

Window 1: 53% to Final Diagnostic 82%

Math:

At Risk for Tier 3

Window 1: 6% to Final Diagnostic 3%

Tier 2:

Window 1: 53% to Final Diagnostic 21%

Tier 1:

Window 1: 41% to Final Diagnostic 76%

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 that we made sure that we closely monitored ELA i-Ready minutes weekly and had incentives for classes and grade levels.

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. Teachers will utilize the math i-Ready program with fidelity and a goal of 45 minutes weekly. Teachers will also include Math intervention during their Math block.

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 for Math will be offered at the school. We will talk to Shruti to come out with our Math Coach and talk with the faculty about how they can help support the school. We will have i-Ready training to pull the pre-requisite reports to train the teachers to differentiate in Math.

She can also be listed in the area of focus on the next page.

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

With the new math curriculum we hope that this can impact our results but we know we have a need in math and individualized instruction must be done to close gaps. Students will use the i-Ready math program with a goal of 45 minutes weekly. We will also have ASP (Academic Support Program) for Math.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

After analyzing the FSA data for the 2021-2022 school year we noticed that many of our students struggled with math.

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

The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is 80% of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the May FAST assessment.

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

The administration 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. Administration has also identified the students with disabilities that are in our lowest 25% and will monitor these students and ensure that they are getting small group instruction in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Shiffrin (shiffrin.courtney@brevardschools.org)

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

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.

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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schedule Shruti Raman and/or Jamie Russell to provide Professional Development. We will look at a push for fluency and the benchmarks for mathematical thinking and reasoning.

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

Work with Jamie Russell, new Math Coach, to help discuss math practices at South Lake. She has shared the iReady Tools for Instruction and Toolbox to South Lake teachers. We also brainstorm how to meet the needs of all learners due to having students that are very high and very low in math.

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

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

Person Responsible Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@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 3-5 students that are substantially deficient or deficient in ELA, Mathematics

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

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

After Professional Development, admin will train the teachers on some math checklists and also an administrator walk-through (informal) tool that we will be using. This will help us to ensure that professional development has been put into practice and we will be able to give feedback.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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

After reviewing our Insight Data from the 2021-2022 survey "Academic Expectations" was our lowest area.

South Lake 4.7
 Brevard 4.4
 Brevard Top Quartile 5.3

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2020-2021 school year we had 6.2 for "Academic Expectations" and would like to see the score for South Lake go at least up to 6.2 again.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and Literacy Coach will follow the Florida's Grades PreK-5 Literacy Instruction Practice Profile guide while conducting walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will be trained on the 5 Core Components (Explicit Instruction, Systematic Instruction, Scaffolded Instruction, Corrective Feedback and Differentiated Instruction) and create look-fors in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

After looking at our data and noticing academic expectations was an area we needed to work on we felt implementing the Literacy Instruction Practice would be a good tool to use to give teachers feedback on areas they may need to work on.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Train teachers on the 5 Core Components and teachers will create look-fors in classrooms for each component.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Administration and Literacy Coach will conduct informal walk-throughs using the Literacy Instruction Practice Guide.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Administration will give feedback to teachers individually as well as school wide on areas we saw that were great and on areas that may need to be worked on.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2022-203 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:

School Operations - South Lake Winter 21-22 8.5; Brevard Average 5.7; Brevard Top Quartile 7.4

Leadership - South Lake Winter 21-22 8.2; Brevard Average 6.3; Brevard Top Quartile 7.7

Learning Environment - South Lake Winter 21-22 8.2; Brevard Average 5.4; Brevard Top Quartile 7.4

Target areas for improvement include:

Academic Expectations - South Lake Winter 21-22 4.7; Brevard Average 4.4; Brevard Top Quartile 5.3

Evaluation - South Lake Winter 21-22 6.2; Brevard Average 6.1; Brevard Top Quartile 7.4

Academic Opportunity - South Lake Winter 6.2; Brevard average 5.2; Brevard Top Quartile 7.1

To help strengthen this area, the leadership team will focus on providing professional development and feedback in the areas of explicit instruction, systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, corrective feedback, and differentiated instruction.

*Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey January 2022 indicated the following:

Compared to other participating elementary schools, South Lake Elementary's highest rated themes were:

-Engagement

-Culture

and the lowest rated themes were:

-Academic Challenge

-Belonging

Compared to other participating elementary schools, South Lake Elementary's highest rated question within the key themes was:

-Do you think your teacher wants you to work your hardest? (which is in the Engagement theme)

and the lowest rated question within the key themes was:

-Does what you learn in class help you outside of school? (which is in the Academic Challenge theme)

Using this data we will work with the students to ensure that we understand their thoughts when answering the questions and also work with the teachers through the core components of literacy instruction.

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

-Communication; teachers are amazing; great staff; engagement; SRO; sense of community; personal interest in our children; STEAM education; Class DoJo; security; positive relationships; amazing PTO/SAC; technology; my child does not want to miss school; and family orientated.

Areas of improvement included:

-Updates on progress besides just seeing grades on a report card would be great; too much focus on testing; lack of transportation options; short notice on events; getting back on track with clubs and extracurricular activities; pick up line; COVID regulations made things difficult; more community involvement; contracts being upheld; planners not being used; and they would like a middle school added. Using this data we will meet more with grade level teams to discuss grading practices, communication from school to home, and ensure that planners are being used in the grade levels that they are required. Our clubs and extracurricular activities are organized on a share drive so that we can ensure that all teachers are engaged in an area that supports extra opportunities for all students.

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

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 and are very active. We listen to all stakeholders to make sure that all members have a voice and are listened to. We have built many relationships with local business partners who have helped our school. We have also partnered with Astronaut High School, Madison Middle School, Pinewood, Mims, and Oak Park to collaborate with community members to see in what ways they can help the schools and in what ways South Lake can help support our community. The administration looks at a variety of ways to boost morale monthly and to help support our teachers.