
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lewis Carroll Elementary School

1 SKYLINE BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32953

<http://www.carroll.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jami Miner L

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lewis Carroll Elementary School

1 SKYLINE BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32953

<http://www.carroll.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">38%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">20%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	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.

The mission of the Lewis Carroll Elementary School is to create positive connections with students so they believe in themselves and go on to become future leaders in their homes and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Lewis Carroll Elementary School is to create a brain-compatible environment where students can achieve their personal best both academically and socially. Parent and community involvement are critical to the education of each child. Teachers facilitate learning by creating a nurturing environment and providing a diversity of experiences that are assessed in equally diverse ways. Students take responsibility for their behavior and learning; their personal best is defined by LIFESKILLS. By achieving academic and personal excellence, students can become contributing members of the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Born, Jenifer	Principal	Develop Master Schedule for K-6 curriculum programming and assign staff members Manage and administer the instructional program to ensure alignment with standards Manage, supervise, evaluate and provide feedback to staff members Provide instructional leadership Collaborate with staff to develop school-wide initiatives for school improvement Develop and provide professional development Collect walk through data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities for improvement of practices Work with families to support student learning Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem solving Teach school-wide character education program Administer BPS Discipline Policy Manage maintenance of facility Manage school budget
Anania, Laura	Assistant Principal	Develop Master Schedule for K-6 curriculum programming and assign staff members Manage and administer the instructional program to ensure alignment with standards Manage, supervise, evaluate and provide feedback to staff members Provide instructional leadership Collaborate with staff to develop school-wide initiatives for school improvement Develop and provide professional development Collect walk through data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities for improvement of practices Work with families to support student learning Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem solving Teach school-wide character education program Administer BPS Discipline Policy Manage, evaluate and provide feedback to teachers in the New Teacher Induction Program Create, implement and manage all school schedules (lunch, activity, duty, and testing) Coordinate and implement school-wide testing Manage, supervise, and evaluate the Academic Support Program. Facilitate, participate and provide feedback for Professional Learning Teams Write the Volunteer of the Year Award Gather information regarding the Five Star Award and write a summary of all school volunteer activities Coordinate a school-wide reading mentor program with the local high schools
Davis- King, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Serve as a resource for professional development Facilitate professional learning communities Provide instructional support and coaching to teachers Analyze school data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

for improvement of practices
 Support progress monitoring and student data analysis throughout the school to generate growth in reading instruction and achievement
 Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem-solving and development of school-wide initiatives for school improvement

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	94	95	90	91	93	116	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	28	19	21	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	1	6	3	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	8	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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		4	3	3	3	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	29

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		10	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	30	27	21	22	21	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	4	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	5	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	11	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	2	2	2	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	62%	57%	74%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	61%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	57%	53%	45%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	78%	63%	63%	72%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	65%	62%	63%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	53%	51%	53%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	57%	53%	78%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	94 (0)	95 (0)	90 (0)	91 (0)	93 (0)	116 (0)	92 (0)	671 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	23 ()	28 ()	19 ()	21 ()	14 ()	13 ()	118 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	21 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 ()	5 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	15 (0)	16 (0)	41 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	73%	60%	13%	54%	19%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	64%	14%	64%	14%
	2018	69%	59%	10%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
	2018	65%	58%	7%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
	2018	84%	68%	16%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	57	54	44	63	65	59	38				
ASN	67			75							
HSP	89	81		69	67						
MUL	62	56		76	63	60					
WHT	75	68	59	80	71	66	62				
FRL	64	62	57	63	59	53	26				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	49	45	50	51	45	47	22				
ELL	73			64							
HSP	81	80		81	65						
MUL	70	44		65	50						
WHT	69	53	41	76	63	49	45				
FRL	61	46	44	67	55	38	24				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	53	45	46	50	44	39	50				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
ELL	45			73							
HSP	77	55		65	60		70				
MUL	67	54	40	67	58						
WHT	74	62	45	72	64	60	78				
FRL	69	59	42	57	60	51	74				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	77
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Scores in Science over multiple years have been inconsistent. Scores were 62% (2016), 78% (2017), 48% (2018), and now 60% (2019). Only 26% of our economically disadvantaged students demonstrated proficiency.

Only 38% of students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency. The assessment includes 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade standards but students must also have a strong foundation from K-2 in science to support that learning. In addition, students need to be able to read and make meaning of complex text in order to demonstrate proficiency in science on the assessment. Due to the low score of 48% in 2018, a greater emphasis was placed on complex text and digging deeply into the science standards. As a result, scores improved by 12 percentage points to 60% in 2019. The 60% is 3 percentage points above district and 7 above state. Improving student performance in nonfiction ELA, integration of knowledge and ideas, and teaching science to the full intent of the standard will continue to be a priority.

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

Learning gains in ELA for students with disabilities (SWDs) in the lowest 25% declined from 50% to 44%. Overall, scores for SWDs improved from 2018 to 2019. The proficiency rate for SWDs went from 49% to 57% which is above the state and district averages. Learning gains for SWDs rose from 45% to 54%. A review of our school practices revealed that ESE teachers co-teaching in an inclusive model did not have common planning with classroom teachers. Student data was shared for the purpose of progress reporting on interims and progress reports and in order to develop IEPs, but ESE teachers were not present for grade level data chats. Without consistent collaboration with ESE teachers and classroom teachers, there was a decline in student performance.

In ELA, overall proficiency increased from 70% to 74% with a state average of 57%. Learning gains were 68% with the state average at 58%. ELA LGs for lowest 25% was 57% with the state average of 53%. In third grade, LC's scores were over the state by 26. For fourth, it was +13, fifth was +8, sixth was +19. Students with disabilities (SWDs) in the lowest 25% only 44%. For economically disadvantaged students in the lowest 25%, 57% were proficient. 79% of non-economically challenged students were proficient. ELA scores increased from 2018 to 2019 +5 in third, +4 in fourth, +8 in fifth, and decreased 6 in sixth grade.

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.

On the 2019 Science Standards Assessment, our fifth grade students scored 60% proficiency whereas the state scored 53 percent. This is only 7 percentage points higher than the state. On the 2018 Science Standards Assessment, only 48% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency falling behind the district score of 57% and the state score of 55%. The same students' scores for FSA ELA were 64% (2019) and 56% (2018). Scores for integration of knowledge and ideas on FSA ELA assessments were 50% proficiency in 2019 and 14% in 2018. In 2018, School Improvement objectives included Visible Learning for Literacy, setting learning targets with success criteria and an increased focus on text complexity and nonfiction reading.

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

ELA proficiency increased from 70% to 74%. Learning gains for ELA increased from 55% to 68%. The lowest 25% increased from 43% to 57%. Scores for SWDs increased from 49% to 57% and learning gains for this group increased for 45% to 54%. There was, however, a decline in the percentage of SWDs in the lowest 25% from 50% to 44%. New actions included implementation of iReady with the lowest 25% in ELA and Math, data chats in Professional Learning Teams, and an increased focus on intervention and support for below grade level students in ELA. In sixth grade, a Walk to Intervention model was implemented in the spring to provide intentional data-driven support in ELA for all sixth graders. Staff professional development was aligned with Visible Learning for Literacy and incorporated the BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The EWS list revealed that 20 of the 29 students (69%) had less than 90% attendance and did not demonstrate proficiency in grade level standards. District/state procedures for attendance have been implemented but have not had an impact on student attendance.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA proficiency for SWDs
3. Science proficiency
4. EWS students with less than 90% attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	<p>Increase proficiency in ELA through a focus on collaborative planning, data monitoring, and implementing school-wide differentiated support for students in ELA.</p>
Rationale	<p>School-wide assessment results for 2018-2019 showed increases in all seven indicators for school grade with an overall +67. In 2019 ELA proficiency increased from 70% to 74%, LGs increased from 55% to 68%, and LG for lowest 25% increased from 43% to 57%. With the SIP focus on collaborative planning and data monitoring, science scores also increased from 47% proficiency to 60% proficiency in 2019. Based on these results, LC will continue to focus on collaborative intentional planning and data monitoring. For 2019-2020, LC will extend a sixth grade ELA pilot program for differentiated support with ELA outside the 90 minute reading block to all students K-6. A focus on ELA is a critical need because it is foundational across all content areas and for all students.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>In May of 2020, 77% of third through sixth grade students will demonstrate proficiency of 3+ on FSA ELA.</p> <p>In May of 2020, 59% of SWDs will demonstrate proficiency of 3+ on FSA ELA.</p> <p>By May of 2020, collaboration amongst grade level teams will increase. Teachers will know grade level student data beyond their classrooms, will determine appropriate interventions, plan instruction, and work together to monitor student progress. Conversations related to diagnosing student needs will become a norm. Teachers will increase use of BPS Decision Tree and the MTSS process to support student learning based on diagnostic data.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Jenifer Born (born.jenifer@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Grade level teams and ESE co-teachers will meet in Professional Learning Teams to plan intentionally, build capacity as practitioners, and to progress monitor and problem solve effective teaching strategies in ELA. Teachers in the school-wide service model will use complex text for differentiation of ELA, will progress monitor weekly, and problem solve with their PLTs based on student data.</p> <p>Research to support PLTs, collaboration</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Administrators, teachers and staff are more productive and more highly motivated when a school's environment is imbued with a sense of collaboration (Birenbaum, Kimron, & Shilton, 2011) and the spirit of collaboration is most easily cultivated when the school's operational structure is built upon a foundation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) (Schmoker, 2004). Collaboration greatly enhances a school's ability to adopt an approach to instructional procedures that better serve all students, including students with disabilities.</p> <p>At Lewis Carroll, our PLCs are timely responses to student issues that are based on intervention rather than remediation, and that generate action steps to ensure the implementation of high-quality evidence-based practices with fidelity (Hoover & Love, 2011). In PLCs, teachers learn from and with each other, and come to see themselves as a community of teachers who focus on the implementation of new ideas and practices tailored to their individual strengths and capacities such that the familiar phrase 'my students' genuinely becomes 'our students'. They reflect on their individual and collective teaching and its impact on student learning, and jointly analyze data from a variety of sources that lead to an examination of instruction where learner-centered challenges are reframed as instructional challenges, where teaching practice is examined, where teachers</p>

observe one another, and where feedback and debriefing are consistently evident (Attard, 2012; DuFour, 2004; Morrissey, 2000; Wood, 2007).

PLCs help bridge the research-to-practice gap at the school and classroom levels because they help teachers focus on student learning, utilize data to inform instruction, and help them to come to see themselves as unique sources of information that leverage the collective skills and competences of the group. Because teachers problem-solve around real issues and teaching events in their own classrooms, they are supporting the implementation of Rtl at the point of actual practice, which is all to the good.

Action Step

1. Build master schedule to include 30 minutes common time for differentiated ELA instruction
2. Assign instructional staff by specific grade level for differentiated instructional groups
3. Teacher teams collaborate to analyze data, evaluate student needs and to establish groups instructional groups
4. Teacher teams determine instructional focus based on student academic needs, choose intervention, select progress monitoring tool, plan instruction, and gather resources
5. Teacher teams meet weekly for collaborative planning
6. Students meet with assigned teacher daily for differentiated ELA instruction
7. Students participate in iReady ELA instruction for 30-45 minutes weekly
8. Teacher teams meet every four to six weeks with admin and literacy coach for progress monitoring, problem solving, share instructional practices, and to evaluate effectiveness of instruction

Description

Person Responsible

Jenifer Born (born.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	<p>Increase proficiency in science through a focus on standards-based instruction in grades three through five using learning targets and success criteria.</p> <p>From 2018 to 2019, student scores increased from 48% to 60% on the Science Standards Assessment in fifth grade with a focus on complex text and increased use of nonfiction reading. In ELA for the same group of students, student proficiency in the strand Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas increased from 14% to 50%.</p>
Rationale	<p>The current group of fifth grade students demonstrated 14% proficiency in the strand Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas on FSA ELA in 2018. This is a significant concern because the correlation above shows the impact proficiency in reading has on performance in science.</p> <p>Problem solving discussions based on LC data with our School Advisory Council, grade levels teams, and the LC Leadership Team focused on continuing the current path of a focus on standards-based instruction and integration of complex texts and nonfiction reading.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>In May 2020, fifth grade Science Standards Assessment proficiency will increase from 60% to 65%.</p> <p>In May 2020, fifth grade proficiency for the strand Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas on FSA ELA will increase from 14% to 30%.</p> <p>In May 2020, collaboration amongst 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teams through vertical planning. The BPS SSA assessment results for the current fifth grade class will be disaggregated and shared with 3rd and 4th grade teams for the purpose of reflection with the goal of improving standards-based planning and instruction.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Anania (anania.laura@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	A focus on standards-based planning and instruction is supported by Robert Marzano in The Essential Model for Achieving Rigor. Visible Learning for Literacy by Nancy Frey, Douglas Fisher, and John Hattie also supports a focus on the standards using learning targets and success criteria.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our data shows inconsistent scores over multiple years. We believe that it is a foundational issue and that all grade levels must increase the focus on standards-based instruction. Last year, LC had gains in all indicators for school grade with a gain of +12 in science scores for fifth grade through collaborative planning and focusing on learning targets and success criteria and increasing use of complex text and nonfiction in ELA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement quarterly vertical team planning 2. Deepen knowledge of implementation of the 5E model of instruction to support planning for standards-based instruction 3. Through PLT collaboration, develop and implement a plan for improved academic vocabulary instruction 4. Increase use of complex and nonfiction texts in both ELA and science through PLT collaboration and implementation of BPS Science resources 5. Admin team (principal, assistant principal, literacy coach) will provide coaching and mentoring to support teachers in standards-based instruction in science

6. Increase use of BPS Science formative assessments; share data with collaborative teams for purpose of problem solving to support student learning

Person Responsible Laura Anania (anania.laura@brevardschools.org)

#3

Title Students identified as EWS have increased progress monitoring for truancy, academics, behavior, and social emotional supports.

Rationale Students identified with Early Warning Signs will have staff members assigned to them for the purposes of mentoring as well as progress monitoring.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve In May 2020, students identified with Early Warning Signs will improve from their baseline data by improving attendance, academic proficiency, and/or behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Staff members assigned to EWS students will monitor their progress, provide support through mentoring, and report to the EWS IPSTeam. They will know their students beyond their data. They will actively problem solve with the team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Jessica Davis-King (davis-king.jessica@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Implement a mentoring program for students identified as EWS. Hanover Research (2016) states that "check and connect" mentoring model have a positive impact on at risk students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Healthy positive relationships have always been a critical component of the culture at Lewis Carroll Elementary. Adults on campus do have relationships with students identified as EWS, but they are currently informal. By establishing a structure, procedures, and protocol for mentoring our EWS students, we will be able to formally monitor their progress toward improving their attendance, academic performance, and behavior.

Action Step

- Description**
1. Meet with EWS IPSTeam
 2. Develop menu of supports for EWS students
 3. Establish yearlong plan for IPSTeam meeting
 4. Build EWS reporting group lists for iReady
 5. Assign mentors to EWS students
 6. Establish expectations/norms for providing support to EWS students

Person Responsible Jessica Davis-King (davis-king.jessica@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).