South Lake Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South Lake Elementary

3755 GARDEN ST, Titusville, FL 32796

https://www.brevardschools.org/southlakees

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation 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.
	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 intervention; 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; be the testing coordinator; and monitor the academic support program. She will continue to review data from previous surveys from students, parents, and staff to make decisions on what is best for South Lake Elementary!
Johnson, Erin	Reading Coach	The Literacy Coach will continue to support teachers with implementing the ELA curriculum and expectations; be a data leader; participate in grade level meetings to support ELA planning; support teachers with teaching practices; support teachers with reading intervention groups; support i-Ready reading; and continue delivering professional development opportunities based on need. The Literacy Coach will help support teachers with the MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support) process and the digital process/forms. She will support teachers through classroom walkthroughs and give specific feedback to help growth. She will monitor the i-Ready reading and math minutes. She will work with teachers during collaborative planning sessions.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council is comprised of key stakeholders. We seek input and feedback during SAC meetings.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Staff and the School Advisory Committee review data regularly. We use data to make instructional decisions that impacts our students and increases the achievement of students in meeting the State's

academic standards. We monitor the lowest 25% regularly and also schools CMA (Collaborative Mutual Accountability) teams focus on the lowest 25%.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	17%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	3	5	2	1	3	1	4	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	12	10	7	8	15	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	1	5	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	7	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	12	10	7	8	15	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	1	5	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	7	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	74	58	53	78	61	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				73			77		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			70		
Math Achievement*	82	58	59	76	49	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				63			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			62		
Science Achievement*	84	58	54	82	60	59	88		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	56			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	79			
HSP	62			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	74			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	78			
HSP	74			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	68			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	74			82			84					
SWD	40			53			62				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	75			83							2	
HSP	56			67							2	
MUL	80			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			84			82				4	
FRL	69			80			75				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	78	73	60	76	63	49	82					
SWD	44	53	50	41	45	33						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	82			73								
HSP	81	67		81	67							
MUL	79	90		64	70							
PAC												
WHT	78	72	61	77	63	53	87					
FRL	77	75	67	71	64	45	74					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	78	77	70	78	75	62	88					
SWD	58	70	60	55	70	55	77					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60			70								
HSP	92			83								
MUL	77			69								
PAC												
WHT	78	80	71	79	79	61	90					
FRL	72	82	69	69	68	50	84					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	47%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	81%	56%	25%	50%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	87%	67%	20%	54%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	93%	60%	33%	59%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	84%	57%	27%	51%	33%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Level 1 - Inadequate: Highly likely to need substantial support for the next grade/course
Level 2 - Below Satisfactory: Likely to need substantial support for the next grade/course
Level 3 - On Grade Level: May need additional support for the next grade/course
Level 4 - Proficient: Likely to excel in the next grade/course
Level 5 - Mastery: Highly likely to excel in the next grade/course

2021-2022 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
All students grades 3-6
Level 1 - 12.9%
Level 2 - 11.2%
Level 3 - 32.1%
Level 4 - 30.4%
Level 5 - 13.4%
2020-2021 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
All students grades 3-6
Level 1 - 10.3%
Level 2 - 11.3%

Level 3 - 33.8%
Level 4 - 32.8%
Level 5 - 11.8%

2021-2022 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
Subgroup - Students with disabilities grades 3-6
Level 1 - 46.2%
Level 2 - 12.8%
Level 3 - 25.6%
Level 4 - 15.4%
Level 5 - 0%
2020-2021 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
Subgroup - Students with disabilities grades 3-6
Level 1 - 30%
Level 2 - 15%
Level 3 - 22.5%
Level 4 - 27.5%
Level 5 - 5%

2021-2022 Accountability components by subgroups for South Lake (FSA)
Students with disabilities:
Math Achievement - 41%
Math Learning Gains - 45%
Math lowest 25% learning gains - 33%
2020-2021 Accountability components by subgroups for South Lake (FSA)
Students with disabilities:
Math Achievement - 55%
Math Learning Gains - 70%
Math lowest 25% learning gains - 55%

Looking at our Mathematics FAST current data for the 2022-2023 school year we noticed the following trends: (This data is input to be able to compare better data in the 2023-2024 school year)
Current 4th graders - 3 level 1s; 3 level 2s
Current 5th graders - 5 level 1s; 9 level 2s
Current 6th graders - 4 level 1s; 11 level 2s

Current 4th grade ESE students - 1 level 1; 1 level 2
Current 5th grade ESE students - 3 level 1s; 1 level 2
Current 6th grade ESE students - 2 level 1s; 4 level 2s

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.
South Lake's students with disabilities in the area of mathematics continue to show the lowest performance when reviewing data and data trends. Last year the VE (Varying Exceptionality) full-time teacher resigned in December and we were unable to fill that position. Due to two resource teachers being spread thin, we think this could be one contributing factor to low performance; however, we are starting to see trends (from 2020 - 2021 to 2021-2022) with the students with disabilities declining in math. Level 1s are increasing and math achievement and learning gains are decreasing.

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

Our scores show the greatest decline in the area of our students with disabilities and math. SWD decreased 14% in students achievement with scoring a level 3 or higher; decreased 25% in students making learning gains; and 22% of the lowest 25% making learning gains.

Students with disabilities have been pulled out of the class to receive services which leads South Lake to believe that while they are getting instruction based on their current academic level, we find that gaps are consistent with the level of current grade level academic standards being addressed and exposed to.

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.

State Data - 2021-2022 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
All students:
Level 1: 28.7%
Level 2: 18.2%
Level 3: 25.6%
Level 4: 17.3%
Level 5: 10.2%

State Data - 2021-2022 Mathematics Assessment Results by Achievement Level (FSA)
Students with disabilities:
Level 1 - 53%
Level 2 - 19.1%
Level 3 - 17.3%
Level 4 - 8.2%
Level 5 - 2.4%

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average are the students with disabilities scoring a level 5 was at 2.4% for the state and 0% at South Lake.

A factor that contributed to this gap and trends would be the consistency of having a classroom teacher in place and the level of supports versus the requirements for grade level material. Interventions to support math have been a struggle for South Lake.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is in the area of meeting the needs of our non-disabled students.

South Lake student's scored 15.8% fewer level 1s versus the state; 7% fewer level 2s; 6.5% greater level 3s; 13.1% greater level 4s; and 3.2% greater level 5s.

South Lake's school improvement was focused on math for the 2022-2023 school year, and we did show gains in the data that was reviewed during the school year. (i-Ready growth K-6 48% on grade level for diagnostic 1 to 73% on grade level in math for diagnostic 2)
We analyzed the FSA data for the 2021-2022 school year and we noticed that many of our students struggled with math so that is why we made it a priority. Administration monitored the i-Ready diagnostic scores with fidelity. We also had the math coach out for Professional Development during grade level meetings. South Lake had a focus on fluency and the benchmarks for mathematical thinking and reasoning. South Lake worked with the math coach to discuss math practices, i-Ready tools for instruction, and brainstormed ways to meet the needs of all learners. Through the data we noticed that we were able to reach the middle and high students but our below grade level students are still struggling.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the early warning system data for South Lake, there are two areas of concern.

New students to South Lake have been flagged on the EWS indicator data and many are with two or more indicators. Our goal is to identify each and every student that had two or more indicators and dig deeper in the data and attendance to help close gaps and support these students.

Fifth and Sixth grade students have the most level 1s in mathematics. Our goal is to identify each and every student that scored a level 1 in ELA and mathematics and look deeper into the data to work on closing gaps. What we have found at South Lake that class size from 3rd grade (18) to 4th grade (22) allows for us to pull 12 from the waitlist. Many times we find gaps in what instruction students have received so our intervention plans will really help to support in this area.

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

1.) South Lake will work on including our exceptional education students into the general education setting whenever possible.
2.) Math intervention groups being done with fidelity during the math blocks
3.) Bringing back a project based learning approach and students being connected to the "why" behind what they are doing and have "real-world" application opportunities and experiences.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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. One area of focus for South Lake will utilize the "Youth Truth Survey"* (grades 3-6) to hear the students voice and turn to students and key stakeholders to make impactful changes in response to the data that was collected. South Lake scored in the 30th percentile rank in the area of Project Based Learning.

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

South Lake will focus on Project-Based Learning:
The survey describes students' experiences collaborating on, improving, and presenting projects. Themes include the frequency of real-world discussions, and the integration of PBLs (Project Based Learning) across subject areas. Here are data points from the Youth Truth Survey* (2022-2023 grades 3-6):

PBL percent positives: % of student who chose a 3 (yes, very often)

(2 - sometimes; 1 - not very much)

Does what you learn during school help you think about what you want to do when you grow up? 22%
Do the things that you learn during class help you outside of school? 28%
Do group projects make you a better student? 40%
Do the things that you learn in one subject help you in other subjects? 13%
Work on hands-on projects with other students? 34%
Talk with classmates about problems in the real world? 19%

*www.brevardschools.org
Click on Parents & Students
Click on Youth Truth Survey

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

South Lake will revisit the specific questions and in our action steps we will list ways to monitor the fidelity of PBLs being implemented in all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A grant from the Fund for Shared Insight and a partnership with SRI Education resulted in the Youth Truth Concurrent and Predictive Validity Study, confirming the efficacy of Youth Truth's student experience

scales in school improvement efforts.

The 15-year research synthesis from the American Educational Research Association (AERA), "Research Synthesis of the Associations Between Socioeconomic Background, Inequality, School Climate, and Academic Achievement," suggests that by promoting a positive climate, schools can allow greater equality in educational opportunities, decrease socioeconomic inequalities, and enable more social mobility for students.

Stanford University's John W. Gardner Center finds that students' motivational beliefs are closely related to their achievement. Classroom practices that encourage effort and understanding and create a caring learning environment will improve student motivation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on our student population and specific focus of how we are different from other schools, being a choice school, it is important that we re-focus on STEAM and PBLs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Give teachers the Youth Truth survey questions so they know what the students are asked and embed those types of questions and conversations in the delivery of instruction. This will also help support teachers with a focus when building PBLs.

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

By When: 8/10/2023 & 5/24/2024

Professional Development on Project Based Learning - admin will coordinate a Project Based Learning PD where they can share information and selected teachers will share what PBL's they have had success doing.

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

By When: 10/13/2023 - Friday Professional Development Day

All grades must do at least one PBL by May 24, 2024

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

By When: May 24, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Admin has built math intervention time into the teacher schedules but it has not been monitored and admin needs to support specific areas of need for the intervention groups. Math intervention is instruction to help students who need extra support to master important math concepts. At its core, math intervention is instruction aimed to filling gaps.

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

Current Data:
Looking at our Mathematics FAST current data for the 2022-2023 school year we noticed the following:
Current 4th graders - 3 level 1s; 3 level 2s
Current 5th graders - 5 level 1s; 9 level 2s
Current 6th graders - 4 level 1s; 11 level 2s

Current 4th grade ESE students - 1 level 1; 1 level 2
Current 5th grade ESE students - 3 level 1s; 1 level 2
Current 6th grade ESE students - 2 level 1s; 4 level 2s

Specific Measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve:
We would like to decrease the number of level 1s and level 2s in grades 4-6 for our general education students and our students with disabilities.

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

Admin will give feedback in the area of math during the intervention block. Admin will use math checklists (district created Reveal) and also an administrator walk-through informal tool (Math classroom observation rubric based on Instructional Practice Guide) related to math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will attend a training from admin to review the tools provided within the i-Ready platform. We will review the instructional groups of students and develop a plan on action.

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

By When: After the first i-Ready diagnostic

Building Thinking Classroom Professional Development presented by Linda Wakeman, 4th grade teacher and the math group that did the book study. Admin will follow up with teachers to see if they put PD to practice in the classroom.

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

By When: Ongoing

Academic Support Program will be offered to students in 3rd - 6th grade after school. Students who have the opportunity to attend ASP include: grade 3-6 students that are substantially deficient or below grade level in math.

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

By When: Depends on funding approximately April 2024

Collaborative planning with teachers to have discussions about math intervention block, what groups are established, and what resources are being used or specific standards targeted. We will also have conversations about students that have IEPs in the area of ELA and see if a math goal is needed and bring that to the child study team.

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

By When: May 2024 - ongoing monthly

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are going to focus on our lowest 25% of students in math and especially focus on students with disabilities.

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

South Lake has a history of decline in the area of math and students with disabilities not making proficiency level or learning gains. Our scores (from comparing the last two year of FSA testing) show the greatest decline in the area of our students with disabilities and math. SWD decreased 14% in students achievement with scoring a level 3 or higher; decreased 25% in students making learning gains; and 22% of the lowest 25% making learning gains.
Our goal is to increase the number of level 3s or higher and increase learning gains in grades 4-6.

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

Data will be reviewed closely on the students that are identified as our lowest 25% and students with learning disabilities in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brockwell (brockwell.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will utilize the math i-Ready program with fidelity and a goal of 45 minutes weekly. There will be a focus on monitoring our students with disabilities and ensuring they get their minutes accomplished.

Person Responsible: Erin Johnson (johnson.erin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year

Build a chart of the lowest 25% and students with math disabilities to track data. The chart will include if the student is receiving Tier 2 or 3 instruction, if the student has been added to the IPST (Individual Problem Solving Team) calendar, FAST progress monitoring 1, 2, and 3 scores, and i-Ready math diagnostic 1 & 2 scores. We will also help support teachers with pre-requisite reports after the i-Ready diagnostics.

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

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year