LOCKMAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on Brevard School Board approved Sept. 9, 2025.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Lockmar parents, staff and students will strive to achieve our vision for excellence.

ACHIEVEMENT – To continue the pursuit of outstanding academic performance.

CURRICULUM – To monitor our curriculum and update technological areas for the future needs of our

children and society.

UNITY – To unify the staff, students, parents, and members of the community to mold Lockmar into an

extended family.

RESPECT – To develop self-esteem, respect for others, and positive attitudes.

COMMUNITY – To use all resources in providing enrichment and experiences for our students.

(Reviewed 2022, Committee formed to review and revise)

Provide the school's vision statement

Lockmar, Where Minds Open To The Future

(Reviewed 2022, Committee formed to review and revise)

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Kathy Campione

campione.kathleen@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversees all responsibilities within the school.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Erika Lucarotti

lucarotti.erika@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists principal with overseeing daily roles and responsibilities of staff members. Ensures instruction and supports are in place.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Manuela Moffitt

moffitt.manuela@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides professional learning and supports to teachers in order to enhance their knowledge of instruction and intervention.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Heather Brittingham

brittingham.heather@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Title 1 Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Ensures compliance with Title 1 processes and procedures. Provides intervention to students that

directly impacts tier 1 instruction.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Lockmar Elementary welcomes stakeholder involvement in the development of the School Improvement Plan. At Lockmar our faculty and staff, families, community and students are given multiple opportunities to provide input on the needs of our students and school to improve student achievement. Following the conclusion of the 2024-2025 school year, stakeholders were invited to participate in our school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), the information gathered during those meetings was used in conjunction with other data collection methods to gather information used to write our School Improvement Plan. These other opportunities included surveys: including the school-based CNA survey sent to families in June 2025, the District Title I Survey, and the Climate Survey, which specifically targets student input. The CNA team, comprised of Administration, highly effective teachers, ESOL, ESE and Specialist Personnel, reviewed all the data and communicated with the School Leadership Team. The School Leadership then collaborated to draft a school Improvement Plan based on the CNA findings. This draft was shared with stakeholder groups for input: faculty and staff reviewed it during the beginning of the year faculty meeting, families and community members reviewed during then August SAC meeting and via the school newsletter. Revisions are made to the SIP by the School Leadership Team based on this input.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The 2025-2026 SIP will be monitored regularly for effective implementation and progress toward focus area achievement goals. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation will occur weekly

with trends reviewed during monthly leadership team meetings. We will revise the SIP based on the needs identified during these review meetings to ensure continuous school improvement.

The SIP will be monitored for impact on student achievement through student assessment data review. Staff will review achievement data, especially for subgroups with the greatest achievement gaps, through monthly data team and/or PLC meetings. The leadership team will meet quarterly to review student achievement data on state assessment. Additionally, after PM2, members of the leadership team will complete a Mid-Year Program review to assess progress towards goals and implementation trends. The results of this review will be shared with stakeholders for input. We will revise the SIP based on the needs identified during these review meetings to ensure continuous school improvement.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **PK-6**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**YES**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**87.5%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**YES**
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)** **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)** **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.*	**2024-25: B** **2023-24: B** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: C** **2020-21:**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment										0
Absent 10% or more school days	6	20	15	16	7	12	10			86
One or more suspensions	2	2	4	3	3	2	6			22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					4					4
Course failure in Math					3					3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	11	36	20	25	21	14	13			140
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	16	35	20	16	21	11	9			128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	5	15	11	25	18	11	10			95
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2025-26

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	7	15	9	10	9	6	9			65

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		7		11						18
Students retained two or more times				1						1

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days	3	3	11	6	7	9	14			53
One or more suspensions	6	2	4	3	3	3	12			33
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					1					1
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				16	16	19	7			58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				17	9	16	9			51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	13	9	10	21						53
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	3	2	4	11	8	14	8			50

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	4	1	3						9
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

> Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	57	62	59	57	61	57	56	58	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	48	58	59	54	59	58	55	57	53
ELA Learning Gains	63	62	60	59	64	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	57	56	50	60	57			
Math Achievement*	57	63	64	58	62	62	49	58	59
Math Learning Gains	64	67	63	67	68	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47	54	51	69	59	52			
Science Achievement	52	62	58	54	60	57	51	58	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	79	62	63	52	57	61	27	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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	58%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	519
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
58%	58%	53%	53%	50%		61%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

	2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	41%	No		
English Language Learners	59%	No		
Black/African American Students	54%	No		
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	57%	No		
White Students	58%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	48%	63%	52%	57%	64%	47%	52%					79%
Students With Disabilities	34%	40%	44%	42%	33%	50%	38%	29%					62%
English Language Learners	42%		69%	67%	39%	59%	58%						79%
Black/African American Students	47%		66%	70%	38%	55%	50%						
Hispanic Students	56%		60%	50%	56%	58%	43%	56%					69%
Multiracial Students	45%		71%		43%	69%							
White Students	62%	59%	63%	44%	63%	68%	45%	56%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	47%	64%	49%	50%	58%	37%	47%					78%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	54%	59%	50%	58%	67%	69%	54%					52%
Students With Disabilities	24%	18%	49%	45%	31%	57%	66%	17%					38%
English Language Learners	28%	30%	49%	40%	38%	54%	71%	30%					52%
Black/African American Students	42%	42%	44%		33%	64%	71%						
Hispanic Students	46%	42%	46%	43%	49%	58%	54%	50%					47%
Multiracial Students	41%		71%		59%	76%							
White Students	69%	70%	67%	50%	68%	69%	70%	61%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	50%	43%	56%	49%	50%	65%	68%	45%					44%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	56%	55%			49%			51%					27%
Students With Disabilities	29%	35%			24%			26%					44%
English Language Learners	24%	0%			24%			33%					55%
Black/African American Students	37%				29%								
Hispanic Students	42%	30%			40%			52%					45%
Multiracial Students	57%	70%			54%								
White Students	67%	74%			58%			61%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	41%			46%			48%					50%

E. 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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	46%	58%	-12%	57%	-11%
ELA	4	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
ELA	5	58%	60%	-2%	56%	2%
ELA	6	75%	70%	5%	60%	15%
Math	3	43%	59%	-16%	63%	-20%
Math	4	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Math	5	58%	57%	1%	57%	1%
Math	6	75%	72%	3%	60%	15%
Science	5	55%	60%	-5%	55%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Sixth grade cohort grew from 40% proficiency on PM3 ELA in 2024 to 75% proficiency on PM3 ELA in 2025. This growth was supported through Title 1 intervention supports and departmentalized teaching.

Fifth grade proficiency rate increased from 40% proficiency rate on 2024 PM3 FAST ELA to 58% proficiency rate on 2025 PM3 FAST ELA. Teachers engaged in focused data review sessions and used this information to inform instruction.

Sixth grade cohort grew from 36% proficiency on PM3 MAth in 2024 to 75% proficiency on PM3 Math in 2025. This growth was supported through Title 1 intervention supports and departmentalized teaching.

Fifth grade proficiency rate increased from 36% proficiency rate on 2024 PM3 FAST Math to 58% proficiency rate on 2025 PM3 FAST Math.

Lowest Performance

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

On FAST ELA PM3, third grade had the lowest proficiency rate at 46% as well as on Math with 43%. Looking deeper into this data, STAR data showed that this cohort of students in second grade scored 51% proficiency on PM3 STAR Reading and 63% proficiency on PM3 STAR Math.

On the FAST Math PM3, math learning gains from the lowest 25% dropped from 69% in 2024 to 46% in 2025. This is 23 point drop.

Greatest Decline

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

On the FAST Math PM3, math learning gains from the lowest 25% dropped from 69% in 2024 to 46% in 2025. The lack on student engagement within tier 1 math instruction could have contributed to the decline.

Greatest Gap

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.

Third grade scores in both ELA and Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average.
In ELA, Lockmar's third grade proficiency rate was 46% while the state proficiency rate was 57%. This is an 11 percent difference. In Math, Lockmar's third grade proficiency rate was 43% while the state proficiency rate was 63%. This is a 20 point difference.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Early Warning Systems Data from 2025SY reveals that 140 students are level 1 on the ELA state assessment and 128 students scored a level 1 on the Math state assessment. In 3rd-6th grade, 37 students scored a level 1 in both ELA and Math. Out of these 37 students, 22 of them are SWDs.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math lowest 25% learning gains
3. Science proficiency
4. ESSA subgroup-SWDs
5. Increase positive culture through collaboration

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Over the past three years, Lockmar's ELA scores have become stagnant as indicated on the FAST PM 3 assessment. Our school proficiency in 2023 was 56%, in 2024 it was 57%, and in 2025 it was 57%. This past year, third grade saw an 8% decline and fourth grade saw an 8% decline when compared to results from 2024. Additionally, our ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% reveals low to no growth as well. The FAST PM 3 results reveal 50% learning gains in 2024 and 51% in 2025. In June 2025, members of our Leadership Team completed a Gap Analysis for Systems of Instruction, which identified various gaps that our school has in planning for instruction.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Lockmar's ELA proficiency will increase from 57% to 60%.

This will occur via the following outcomes: 3rd grade ELA proficiency rates on FAST PM3 will increase from 46% to 49%; 4th grade ELA proficiency rates on FAST PM3 will increase from 49% to 52%; fifth grade will continue to make gains an increase their ELA proficiency rate from 58% to 61%; and sixth grade will continue to make gains by increasing their ELA proficiency rate from 75% to 78%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring will be done through FAST assessments PM1 and PM2, iReady diagnostics 1 and 2, and intervention monitoring tools. Classroom walkthroughs will be completed and targets feedback will be given to support instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Erika Lucarotti, Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Collaborative Planning Sessions with District and School based literacy coaches to plan benchmark-aligned instruction. (T) Data/MTSS review of student performance and progress will occur monthly. (T) 2 additional teachers and 1 instructional assistant will be used daily to target students that are currently struggling to meet grade level expectations in ELA, as identified by the BPS Intervention Decision Tree. (T) • Teachers will use Magnetic Reading and related manipulatives in grades K-2 to increase phonics and ELA student Achievement. (T) • School Site license for Lexia to provide skill-based supplemental instruction for Tier 2 and 3 students to work on deficit skills and increase student achievement in ELA. (T) Additional instruction in reading will be provided by our After School Program (ASP) supported by the district.

Rationale:

Teachers will increase rigor in the classroom by delivering lessons that aligned to the benchmark. They will also be able to address the various learning gaps of their students by analyzing data and creating small groups for differentiated instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Collaborative planning to support benchmark aligned instruction and small group supports.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Erika Lucarotti, AP	On going; daily

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

ELA proficieny rates for 3-6 have have shown low to no growth over the past several years on FAST PM3. Lesson plans are not reaching the depth of the benchmarks/standards which are causing gaps in student knowledge and low proficiency rates. Collaborative planning will support instructional delivery that is aligned to the benchmark.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Over the past three years, Lockmar's math scores have become stagnant as indicated on the FAST PM 3 assessment. Our school proficiency in 2023 was 49%, in 2024 it was 58%, and in 2025 it was 57%. This past year, third grade saw an 11% decline and fourth grade saw an 20% decline when compared to results from 2024.
 Additionally, our math learning gains for the lowest 25% reveals a 23% drop from 69% in 2024 to 46% in 2025.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Lockmar's math proficiency will increase from 57% to 61%.

This will occur via the following outcomes: 3rd grade math proficiency rates on FAST PM3 will increase from 43% to 47%; 4th grade math proficiency rates on FAST PM3 will increase from 52% to 56%; fifth grade will continue to make gains and increase their math proficiency rate from 58% to 62%; and sixth grade will continue to make gains by increasing their math proficiency rate from 75% to 79%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring will be done through FAST assessments PM1 and PM2, iReady diagnostics 1 and 2, and intervention monitoring tools. Classroom walkthroughs will be completed and targets feedback will be given to support instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Heather Brittingham, Title 1 Coordinator

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).
Description of Intervention #1:
Teachers will utilize small groups in order to provide targeted instruction to address specific learning

needs and ensure support (T). Manipulatives will be available daily to provide concrete learning opportunities (T). Additional instruction in math will be provided by our After School Program (ASP) supported by the district.

Rationale:
Small group instruction allows teachers to address various gaps in student knowledge and manipulatives provides a concrete way of solving abstract concepts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:
Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Teachers will use mall group instruction in math.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Classroom teachers	weekly/on going

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will use small groups to support differentiate instruction in math in order to close various achievement gaps of their students.

Action Step #2
Student use of manipulatives during math instruction.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Classroom teachers	weekly/ on going

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will provide manipulatives for students who need a concrete representations to support the mathematical thinking and reasoning of abstract problems.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Lockmar Elementary school will increase school proficiency in science by at least 3% to be in line with the district strategic goals. Improvements in instructional planning using the state science benchmarks for planning across all grade levels will be the focus, with an extra emphasis on grade 5.

Use of district approved curriculum (Stemscopes) with fidelity. In addition, the STEM teacher will plan collaboratively with grade levels to support learning objectives during weekly STEM classes on the activity wheel. Teachers in grades 3-5 will incorporate PENDA required minutes into their center activities during the ELA block. Weekly use reports will be run by the leadership team and use will be monitored for fidelity. (T)

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Proficiency in Science for Grade 5 for the 24-25 school year was 55%. To be in line with the BPS strategic plan, Lockmar will increase proficiency to at least 58% as measured by the state science assessement.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Weekly monitoring of PENDA usage and pass rates will be done by the leadership team. In addition the Leadership Team will meet regularly with the STEM teacher to review data and make changes as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kathleen Campione, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Collaborative Planning for benchmark aligned instruction. Students will take field trips to Brevard Zoo to involve students in science standards-based enrichment and learning that is difficult to duplicate in the classroom. (T)

Rationale:
Collaborative planning ensures that all stakeholders are on the same page and are supported by each other.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Kathleen Campione, Principal	Weekly/Monthly/As needed

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Weekly reports of PENDA usage will be monitored for fidelity to ensure benchmark aligned instruction.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Multiple Early Warning Signs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Early Warning Systems Data from 2025SY reveals that 140 students (46%) are level 1 on the ELA state assessment and 128 students (42%) scored a level 1 on the Math state assessment. In 3rd-6th grade, 37 students (12%) scored a level 1 in both ELA and Math. Out of these 37 students, 22 of them (59%) are SWDs.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Given an emphasis on Multiple Early Warning Signs, students in grades 3-6 will decrease the amount of level 1s in ELA and math by 5% as evidenced on the FAST.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The school based leadership team will review student data after each progress monitoring assessment for FAST and iReady. Additionally, teachers, coaches and administrators will monitor students' responses to intervention monthly at our MTSS meetings. Interventions will be revised,

based on how students are responding to the interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Manuela Moffitt, Literacy Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
In order to close the achievement gaps of our students, our teachers will utilize small groups to provide instruction in a more intensive and differentiated manner. Small group instruction an evidence based strategy that allows for scaffolding of information so students can be successful with content and teachers can create building blocks for achievement. Small group instruction will be provided to support the mastery of the identified needs of our students in both ELA and Math.

Rationale:
Students have various levels of understanding and some have multiple identified areas of concern. Small group instruction is an evidence based strategy that supports the teachers abilities to differentiate instruction in order to address identified areas of concerns thus closing the achievement gap.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Description of Intervention #2:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Description of Intervention #3:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Identify areas of concern for students and implement small group instruction to provide scaffolds and supports to students. Collaborative planning sessions will be held with the support of District and

school based literacy coaches in order to will train teachers on small group instruction. Title 1 funds will be utilized to hire substitutes so that teachers can have extended professional learning time and develop lans that support differentiation of small groups. Monthly grade level meetings will be used to celebrate achievements and make adjustments as needed.

Person Monitoring:
M. Moffitt, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Monthly beginning in Augusty 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

* Teachers will be required to upload attendance of small group instruction into FOCUS. * Sign-in sheets will be evidence of teacher attendance at monthly review meetings and trainings. * Agendas for grade level meetings will reveal the discussion of small group instruction and progress within interventions. *Walkthrough data collected by coaches and administration will indicate the fidelity of small group instruction.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

The approved SIP is shared with stakeholders through multiple outlets. Our SIP is shared with families through our Title I Annual meeting and sent to all families through our FOCUS communication app. The SIP is also shared on our school website for all stakeholders to access at (Documents | Lockmar Elementary). We offer the ability to translate the SIP into the stakeholder's home language upon request. The approved SIP is shared with faculty and staff during a faculty meeting and email. It is also shared with stakeholders during our School Advisory team meeting. Progress toward SIP goals is reviewed after each progress monitoring assessment window (PM2 and PM3) and is shared with stakeholders during faculty meetings, SAC meetings, and with families through our FOCUS app.

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Our school is dedicated to fostering strong, positive relationships with families, parents, and community members. To achieve this goal, we have developed a Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with our families and community members. Summaries of our school's PFEP

are shared with our stakeholders on our school website and sent home with every family. The full version of our PFEP can be found on our school website- (Documents | Lockmar Elementary) and a hard copy is kept in the front office. This plan is translated into family's home languages based on our home language report. The PFEP highlights how our school plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders to support the needs of our students. This includes hosting family engagement events with a focus on strategies to support learning at home, two-way communication strategies, translation opportunities, and methods for keeping families informed of student progress throughout the school year.

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

To strengthen our school's academic program, we are implementing a multifaceted approach that focuses on increasing student engagement, improving instructional practices, and building staff collective efficacy in all core MESH subject areas. To increase student engagement, we plan to use a variety of multisensory manipulatives in Mathematics (T) and encourage our instructional staff to collaborate in grade level meetings, decreasing transition times and increasing effective educational minutes. To improve instructional practices, we will collaboratively plan with the help our school-based literacy coach (T), and a district level coach, focusing on maximizing our Tier I instructional time. To build collective efficacy we plan to lean heavily on best-practices, the Science of Reading and our district curricula and allow time for teaching teams to collaborate and cooperatively plan. Additionally, we will emphasize the importance of the small group educational time and support teachers by providing benchmark and standards aligned materials, and empower them to use them through training on effective small-group classroom practices. (T)

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

Our School Improvement Plan is a comprehensive plan that utilizes federal, state, and local services, resources and programs collaboratively to ensure all students can meet challenging state standards. Student Services and Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS) provide

instructional support services to students, families, and teachers of students with exceptionalities. Title IX/McKinney Vento provides support and services like school supplies, tutoring, counseling, and transportation for our families in transition. Title III provides instructional support for our ELL students and translation opportunities for families. Through Title II, professional development and training is provided for our staff to improve instructional practices. In collaboration with the Early Learning Coalition of Brevard, we host a Voluntary Prekindergarten Program at our elementary school. Our VPK program is a free early learning program to prepare four-year olds for kindergarten and build the foundation for school success.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Our school has a variety of services designed to help students, parents, and teachers develop positive learning experiences. Students have access to a school counselor and social worker. These professionals can assist students in addressing challenges, fostering resilience, managing emotions, and applying interpersonal skills in both individual and group settings. Basic care needs are also addressed. Mentors are available for students assigned by campus staff, district mentors, and community mentor volunteers. Character education is built into our school environment through our daily morning meetings. Our Florida Standards-based character education program focuses on character development, mental health, and resiliency. Consultations are available to parents and teachers to include information on referral services in the community with the goal that families have the resources and support needed to address the overall mental wellness of our students.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Students in K-6 utilize Xello lessons and fourth grade participates in CTE s that enhances skills in word processing, spreadsheets, cybersecurity, coding, and digital literacy.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

At Lockmar, the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) system is in place. This evidence-based model uses data-based problem solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. The instruction and intervention are delivered to all students in varying intensities (tiers)

based on student need. Need driven decision-making ensures that support and resources reach the appropriate students at the level needed to accelerate student performance and reach proficiency. Data, along with teacher observation and under advisement from the the district decision tree and the Literacy Coach determines placement of the student in a Tiered intervention. Students' Response to Intervention is monitored with grade-appropriate progress monitoring tools and recorded for data analysis. Student placement is reconsidered every 6 weeks cycle based on the data gathered or more frequently at bi-weekly grade level data meetings.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Teacher retention increases when they have access to professional learning opportunities and supports that are aligned with their needs, interests, and goals. Teachers will participate in monthly professional learning communities (PLC). During these PLC meetings, job-embedded professional learning will be provided that is focused on data analysis and instructional strategies. Professional development focused on teacher clarity will occur during preplanning and quarterly (T). New teachers will participate in the New Teacher Academy and be supported by a highly effective school-based mentor. Struggling teachers will also have the opportunity to work with a school or district-based mentor. Our Literacy Coach will provide job-embedded professional learning through coaching cycles. (T) Instructional Assistants will work under the supervision and guidance of certified teachers. (T)

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Through the BPS Thrive By Five initiative, Lockmar Elementary works with other local childcare providers and families to provide education support services to pre-school children. This initiative provides information and support to local families beginning at birth. Additionally, to aid in the transition from an early childhood education program to Lockmar Elementary School, we offer a Kindergarten orientation event. During this orientation, families can experience some of the learning activities in kindergarten. Families, with their children, are encouraged to tour the school, participate in kindergarten centers, and speak with key school personnel including teachers, ESOL instructors, Title I and Administration.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSIor CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

n/a

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00