Lewis Carroll Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 9/23/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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%)
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

Lewis Carroll Elementary School

1 SKYLINE BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32953

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/23/2020, Jami Miner L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).	

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	57	80	83	84	76	93	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	8	7	6	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	5	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	7	9	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	0	1	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	7	9	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	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	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	
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	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	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				
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				
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%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

From Winter 2019 to Fall 2020, only 72.5% of students maintained or demonstrated a gain, down from 88% in Winter 2019. The Fall 2020 Diagnostic, 51.6% demonstrated proficiency down from 57% Winter 2019.

After the interruption in face to face instruction due to Covid-19, LC iReady ELA Diagnostic Scale Scores have shown that many students demonstrated declining performance. iReady data for ELA showed that 27% of our students (1st-6th) demonstrated a loss from Winter 2019 Diagnostic SS to Fall 2020 Diagnostic in iReady ELA. Of the students demonstrating a loss, 27.6% demonstrated performance below grade level expectations. Of the students receiving free/reduced lunch at LC, 33% showed a loss. Only 59% maintained or showed a gain compared with 72.5% of the general population of LC. Of students with disabilities, 32% showed a loss and only 69% maintained or demonstrated a gain compared with 72.5% of the general population.

The Lewis Carroll Elementary BPIE 2018 identified School Priority Indicators include:
1. General and special education teachers regularly plan instruction together
2. Administrators ensure collaborative planning time is reflected in general and special education schedules and instructional plans
3. Activity teachers have regular opportunities to consult with special education teachers

Both students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students had the greatest losses in ELA. Having consistent face to face differentiated support and instruction in a school environment is very important for these vulnerable populations. Improving our processes to support access and achievement for students with disabilities and free/reduced lunch is a priority.

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

From Fall 2019 to Winter 2019, 88% of students maintained or demonstrated a gain. Only 3% of students demonstrated a loss from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019, but from Winter 2019 to Fall 2020, 27.4% of students demonstrated a loss and only 72.5% maintained or demonstrated a gain.

Using multiple data points from the BPS Decision Tree, students were identified in each grade level who are below grade level in ELA: K (12), 1st (29), 2nd (18), 3rd (15), 4th (14), 5th (20), 6th (21), total (129). First grade (29) has the highest number of below grade level students, followed by fifth (20) and sixth grades (21). 46% of the BGL students are in our primary grades. For K-2, in 2018-2019, there were 16 retentions. In 2019-2020, there were 17. All of the students were retained based on below grade level ELA performance. Based on this data, one area of concern is emergent reading instruction in K-2 and another is supporting struggling readers 3-6. Implementation of school-wide intervention revealed that there was a need for professional development and support related to the strategic use of diagnostic tools and aligned instructional strategies. Assessment and intervention timelines had to be modified to allow for teacher training. School-wide intervention was beginning to have an impact on student achievement in ELA, but then there was a school closure for 4th quarter.

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 scores on SSA have been very inconsistent for multiple years: Science proficiency scores were: 60% in 2019, 49% in 2018, 78% in 2017, 62% in 2016.

Formative Assessments aligned with the science standards given in 2019 in fifth grade showed that only 5% were scoring in the proficient range at the beginning of the year. By mid-year, 68% of students taking the assessment either maintained or demonstrated a gain. Instruction in Science in third through fifth grades had an emphasis on hands on standards based instruction and the teams were collaborating regularly. Anecdotal records support that the instruction was aligned with grade level standards. At the beginning of 2020, this year's group of fifth graders took the same Formative Assessment and 14% of those students scored in the proficient range, up from 5% the year before. Our history with inconsistent SSA scores and ELA data showing that students are not as proficient as they were before the closure of the school due to Covid-19 are compelling reasons to identify science standards instruction as a priority.

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

Last year, we had a school wide designated time for intervention in ELA included in the master schedule. After one semester of instruction, iReady Diagnostic Scale Scores from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019 supported that interventions were having an impact on student performance in ELA. 88% of students maintained or demonstrated a gain. 57% demonstrated proficiency. Only 3% of students demonstrated a loss. In the school-wide intervention model, all students were grouped based on their academic needs for ELA and all instructional personnel worked with the students daily. Interventions were aligned with student diagnostic data and groups was progress monitored. Teachers met regularly to discuss student needs and to regroup students when goals were met. Other 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 had a positive impact on student achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Retentions are a potential area of concern. For K-2, in 2018-2019, there were 16 retentions. In 2019-2020, there were 17. All of the students were retained based on below grade level ELA performance. All retainees were identified as substantially deficient and intervention was planned and

implemented. Although there were systems for identification of those students prior to a retention and progress monitoring plans were in place, these students did not make the gains necessary for promotion.

The EWS data includes in school and out of school suspensions for 2019.2020. At LC, there were 17 students who were suspended in or out of school. In related data, there were 62 of 597 students (10%) at Lewis Carroll Elementary with one or more referrals. There were 21 students (3.5%) with three or more incidents and six of those students had 10 or more referrals. Student referrals by grade level: 1st (12), 2nd (7), 3rd (12), 4th (6), 5th (6), 6th (19). Of the 62 students with referrals, 22.5% are students with disabilities. Our student population at LC includes 21.8% students with disabilities. When students have referrals, they are not in class with access to learning. Also, their behaviors negatively impact the classroom learning environment interfering with their teachers right to teach, their own right to learn and the right to learn of others.

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

1. ELA proficiency - Standards-based instruction, standards mastery
2. BGL ELA students - Intervention
3. Emergent Literacy
4. Science Standards - Progress monitoring
5. School Wide Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency in ELA through a focus on collaborative planning for standards-based instruction, quarterly progress monitoring, and implementing differentiated scaffolded support for students in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:	According to iReady Diagnostic 1 data, 47% of LC students were on or above grade level, 41% were one grade level below, and 12% were two or more grade levels below. Based on this data, our goal is to increase student proficiency in ELA resulting in a minimum of 52% on or above grade level by the third diagnostic. By May of 2021, collaboration amongst grade level teams will increase. Teachers will plan standards-based instruction collaboratively and will monitor student mastery using common assessments. Teachers will increase use of the BPS Decision Tree and the MTSS process to support student learning based on diagnostic data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Davis-King (davis-king.jessica@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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 to provide effective teaching strategies and scaffolding in ELA. Teachers will implement standards based instruction and will monitor students' progress through iReady Standards Mastery Assessments.
Rationale for 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. Vygotsky coined a definition of instructional scaffolding that focused on teacher practices. He defined this as, 'the role of teachers and others in supporting the learner's development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level' (Raymond, 2000). Vygotsky believed that learning does not occur in isolation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement year-long professional development focused on scaffolding, literacy instruction, and social emotional learning
2. Determine instructional focus based on standards focus documents and student academic needs, collaborate to analyze data, evaluate student needs, establish instructional groups, and plan scaffolded standards based instruction
3. Build master schedule with daily intervention time designated for all grade levels
4. Track data and plan focused discussions during monthly data PLTs (general education teachers and exceptional education teachers) with the admin team
5. Implement intervention and planned progress monitoring for substantially deficient students through the MTSS/IPST process
6. Monitor standards mastery using the district recommended standards and the iReady Standards Mastery Assessment (grades 2-6)
7. Incorporate PASI and PSI for progress monitoring as required in the Decision Tree for diagnostic purposes and plan supplemental instruction for students with phonological awareness and phonics needs
8. Establish reporting groups for iReady to include SWDs, EWS, and FRL for progress monitoring

9. Establish a plan for supporting SWDs, EWS, and FRL in the case of a school closure

10. Schedule common collaborative planning for ESE and Gen Ed teachers (BPIE)

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last school year, there were 62 of 670 students (9%) at Lewis Carroll Elementary with one or more referrals. There were 21 students (3%) with three or more incidents and six of those students had 10 or more referrals. Student referrals by grade level: 1st (12), 2nd (7), 3rd (12), 4th (6), 5th (6), 6th (19). When students have referrals, they are not in class for learning. Referrals for behavior are used as an opportunity to learn. Corrective strategies are chosen to best reinforce the learning, but the process itself is a reactive measure. Improving our management of student discipline at Lewis Carroll Elementary with aligned proactive measures for all students especially those who struggle with behavior is very important.
Measurable Outcome:	Last year, 9% of LC students had referrals. In May 2021, there will be less than 6% of students at Lewis Carroll Elementary with discipline referrals. Of the 3% of students with 3 or more referrals, six had 10 or more. This year, those six students will be identified, monitored, and proactively supported by administration and their teachers. In May 2021, there will be a decreased incidence of referrals for all six students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement professional development for Conscious Discipline. Conscious Discipline has significant research supporting its effectiveness, and it has been adopted by BPS as a program to support Social Emotional Learning for students. Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL's SELect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL's SELect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs, in the CASEL Guide to Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs. This designation indicates that Conscious Discipline can play a central role in a school's approach to promoting student social and emotional learning. The CASEL Program Guide identifies well-designed, evidence-based SEL programs that offer comprehensive programming, ongoing training and support, and a demonstrated statistically significant positive impact on student behavioral outcomes and/or academic achievement. Conscious Discipline is an adopted program for BPS for Social Emotional Learning. Conscious Discipline is an approach to sup
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL's SELect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL's SELect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs, in the CASEL Guide to Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs. This designation indicates that Conscious Discipline can play a central role in a school's approach to promoting student social and emotional learning. The CASEL Program Guide identifies well-designed, evidence-based SEL programs that offer comprehensive programming, ongoing training and support, and a demonstrated statistically significant positive impact on student behavioral outcomes and/or academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan and implement yearlong professional development for classroom teachers to support Conscious Discipline K-6 (preplanning followed by Friday PD sessions)
2. Teachers join BlackBoard Ultra and access coursework and resources
3. Modify current yearlong school-wide character education plan to include new learning related to Conscious Discipline
4. Schedule quarterly meetings for ESE teachers and activity teachers for the purposes of collaboration to support implementation of student behavior plans
5. Identify and proactively support students with chronic behavior (admin and teachers)

Person Responsible   Jenifer Born (born.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency in science through a focus on standards-based instruction grades three through five using learning targets and success criteria. 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 scores on SSA have been very inconsistent for multiple years: Science proficiency scores were: 60% in 2019, 49% in 2018, 78% in 2017, 62% in 2016. Formative assessments aligned with the science standards given in 2019 in fifth grade showed that only 5% were scoring in the proficient range at the beginning of the year. At the beginning of 2020, this year's group of fifth graders took the same standards formative assessment and 14% of those students scored in the proficient range, up from 5% for the students from the previous year. Our history with inconsistent SSA scores and the data showing that only 15% of students are demonstrating proficiency on beginning of the year standards formative assessments are compelling reasons to continue on our path to improvement through a school improvement initiative.
Measurable Outcome:	In May 2021, fifth grade Science Standards Assessment proficiency will increase from 60% to 65%. In May 2021, ELA scores in the strand of Knowledge and Key Ideas will increase 5% for this group of students. By May 2021, increased collaboration amongst 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade will occur using vertical teaming practices. 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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
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:	School 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. Two years ago, 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.

Action Steps to Implement

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 collaborations, 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 improve instruction and support student learning

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

n/a

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The positive school culture and environment at Lewis Carroll Elementary wouldn't be possible without strong relationships among our teachers, students, families of students, volunteers, School Advisory Council, Lewis Carroll PTO, community agencies, church groups, and our Business Partners.

Our approach to building strong relationships and a positive school culture and environment is to:
1) Provide information in a timely and proactive manner
2) Practice transparency
3) Inclusive dialogue for problem solving

At LC, we are a Glasser Quality School focused on quality relationships, quality environment, and quality work. All stakeholders are committed to our vision and our mission. This commitment is reinforced through inclusion in our presentations, posts on our school website, daily news segments, Facebook, BlackBoard Connect, and regular opportunities for feedback. This year, we are adding Conscious Discipline for Social-Emotional Learning for grades K-6 and as we embark on this new journey our stakeholders will begin learning about this framework too.

This year posed many challenges due to Covid-19 and the "new normal" in terms of protocols, routines, and procedures we needed to implement. Regular two way dialog with all stakeholders was necessary in order to be certain that staff, students, and families had confidence in our reopening plan at LC. Issues were problem solved and practices were developed and the plan was implemented with fidelity.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.