

Brevard Public Schools

Lewis Carroll Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	26
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: 8/20/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

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.

Developing respectful citizens through an engaging and caring learning environment that maximizes academic achievement and personal growth for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we will achieve greatness!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Born, Jenifer	Principal	<p>Develop Master Schedule for K-6 curriculum programming and assign staff members</p> <p>Manage and administer the instructional program to ensure alignment with standards</p> <p>Manage, supervise, evaluate and provide feedback to staff members</p> <p>Provide instructional leadership</p> <p>Collaborate with staff to develop school-wide initiatives for school improvement</p> <p>Develop and provide professional development</p> <p>Monitor and manage school security with Threat Assessment Team</p> <p>Manage Conscious Discipline Action Team, School Improvement Plan Team, Leadership Team</p> <p>Facilitate, participate and provide feedback for Professional Learning Teams</p> <p>Collect walk through data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities for improvement of practices</p> <p>Work with families to support student learning</p> <p>Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem solving</p> <p>Teach school-wide character education program</p> <p>Administer BPS Discipline Policy</p> <p>Manage maintenance of facility</p> <p>Manage school budget</p>
Kerr, Sandra	Assistant Principal	<p>Develop Master Schedule for K-6 curriculum programming and assign staff members</p> <p>Manage and administer the instructional program to ensure alignment with standards</p> <p>Manage, supervise, evaluate and provide feedback to staff members</p> <p>Provide instructional leadership</p> <p>Collaborate with staff to develop school-wide initiatives for school improvement</p> <p>Develop and provide professional development</p> <p>Collect walk through data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities for improvement of practices</p> <p>Work with families to support student learning</p> <p>Engage in Threat Assessment Team activities and problem solving</p> <p>Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem solving</p> <p>Administer BPS Discipline Policy</p> <p>Manage, evaluate and provide feedback to teachers in the New Teacher Induction Program</p> <p>Create, implement and manage all school schedules</p> <p>Coordinate and implement school school-wide testing</p> <p>Manage, supervise, and evaluate the Academic Support Program</p> <p>Facilitate, participate and provide feedback for Professional Learning Teams</p> <p>Publish the Volunteer of the Year Award</p> <p>Gather information regarding the Five Star Award and write a summary of all school volunteer activities</p> <p>Coordinate a school-wide reading mentor program with the local high schools</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davis-King, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<p>Serve as a resource for professional development</p> <p>Facilitate professional learning communities</p> <p>Provide instructional support and coaching to teachers</p> <p>Analyze school data with Leadership Team to seek trends and opportunities for improvement of practices</p> <p>Support progress monitoring and student data analysis throughout the school to generate growth in reading instruction and achievement</p> <p>Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem-solving and development of school-wide initiatives for school improvement</p> <p>Engage in Threat Assessment Team activities and problem solving</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/20/2021, 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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

607

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	79	77	86	93	79	90	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	12	8	14	22	15	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	4	11	1	6	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	16	12	9	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	6	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	2	9	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	3	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	11	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				74%	62%	57%	70%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	60%	58%	55%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	63%	63%	76%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	65%	62%	63%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	53%	51%	49%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	57%	53%	47%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	64%	14%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

District-wide, the tool used for progress monitoring is iReady in both ELA and Mathematics. For Science, district created standards-based formative assessments are utilized.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66%	69%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	70%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	47%	63%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52%	35%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	58%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	31%	63%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	36%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	26%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	40%	45%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	30%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	24%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	25%	20%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42%	56/5	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45%	45%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	22%	50%
	English Language Learners	50%	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%	38%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	27%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	24%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75%	83%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	80%	92%
	Students With Disabilities	53%	53%	63%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	40%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	28%	76%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	20%	60%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	73%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	65%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	56%	63%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	57%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	53%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	53%	69%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	13%	28%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	3%	11%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	19%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	n/a	0%
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56%	69%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	68%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	48%	48%	56%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	57%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	43%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	48%	44%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	49	52	45	52	52	35	52				
ELL	27			27							
HSP	70	71		68	57	55					
MUL	61			61							
WHT	72	62	43	74	58	48	65				
FRL	59	55	25	57	46	36	44				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
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	61
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	
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	60
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Scores for proficiency in ELA have been in the seventies for the last five years: 71 (2021), 74, 70, 74, 72. iReady progress monitoring ELA data for 5th and 6th grade showed that the percentage of proficiency had increased by the third diagnostic given in May 2021. The percentage of students with learning gains overall were: 63 (2021), 68, 55, 61, and 63.

Scores for proficiency in mathematics are also in the seventies for the last five years: 73 (2021), 78, 76, 72, 72. iReady progress monitoring mathematics data for 5th and 6th grade showed that the percentage of proficiency had increased by the third diagnostic given in May 2021.

In science, the scores have been inconsistent for the last five years (64, 60, 48, 78, 62). Only 22% of students with disabilities (SWD) showed proficiency and 24% in the subgroup Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL) showed proficiency.

The overall Federal Index for the subgroup ELL was 27% and the minimum target is 41%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning Gains for the lowest 25% were the greatest need in both ELA and mathematics. Only 39% of the students at Lewis Carroll Elementary in the lowest 25% showed learning gains in ELA. Only 45% of students from Lewis Carroll Elementary in the lowest 25% were proficient in mathematics.

Throughout the 2020-21 school year, many students participated in eLearning. By the end of the year, most students had returned to in person learning. Students who participated in eLearning showed a decline in their overall proficiency when compared to in person learners. We believe that those students most at risk were disadvantaged during the 2020-21 school year, especially if they

were engaged in eLearning.

Our plan must target the students identified as ELL to plan supports and scaffolding for success.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Students in the lowest 25% need consistent differentiated, scaffolded instruction to meet their academic needs. Last year, there was a lack of consistency in providing small group instruction for students in both ELA and in mathematics and this group of students did not demonstrate learning gains. eLearning may have been a factor in less opportunity for small group, differentiated instruction. Also, the use of iReady instruction for additional Tier 2 support for students in both ELA and math was not implemented with fidelity.

This school year, in 2021-22, we believe a focus on walk to intervention model and closer iReady data monitoring for usage (45 minutes weekly in ELA and math) and pass rate (80% or higher) as well as domain shut offs will result in higher learning gains for our lowest 25%.

There was a lack of scaffolding and support for students identified as ELL. Multiple factors influenced their lack of progress and many of these students were eLearners in 2020-2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Of the seven indicators for school grade, the only increase was in Science. The percentage of 3+ for 2019 was 60% and in 2021 it was 64%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In fifth grade, the teachers focused on nonfiction text to support the Science standards and breaking down scenarios. The instruction included reading, writing, listening, and speaking. There was increased collaboration and problem solving that required critical thinking. There was increased use of graphics, charts, tables, and diagrams for analysis. The follow up discussions were critical in the learning cycle and this helped the students to develop a deeper understanding of the science concepts.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

This school year, we will implement new ELA standards, and new ELA curriculum. This will increase engagement, teacher clarity, rigor, and more response to writing. We believe that these new supports will accelerate student learning. Additionally, the teachers will utilize iReady Tool Box supports based on iReady diagnostic data.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

During preplanning, teachers engaged in learning communities and relationship building, including trauma informed practice. Additionally, the team worked collaboratively to develop walk to intervention scheduling, grouping, and progress monitoring collection points. The BEST standards and the new Benchmark curriculum was also a training point, with some teachers attending a bonus week of preplanning.

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

We are in year 2 of Conscious Discipline training and are an anchor school for the district. This focus will support our teachers in building our school family and deepen relationships with our students. The school has a "Conscious Discipline" action team--who have led this initiative with our staff. Ongoing, throughout this school year 2021-22, our staff and faculty will engage in a book study focused on Conscious Discipline.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

School-wide assessment data from FSA ELA 2021 showed a significant decrease in the percentage of learning gains for the lowest 25% of Lewis Carroll Elementary students. Only 39% of the students identified in the lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains. For this school year, that measure was for fifth and sixth grade students because those students had scores from 2019 for comparison.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Lewis Carroll Elementary will implement a two-pronged approach to differentiation of instruction for all students: Walk to Intervention Model and iReady instruction for all.

A Walk to Intervention model will be implemented school-wide to provide differentiated support with ELA outside the 90 minute reading block for all students K-6. Students in the lowest 25% will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 support in this model based on data from the BPS Decision Trees. A focus on implementing differentiated support is a critical need because ELA is foundational across all content areas and for all students.

All students will receive 30-45 minutes of iReady ELA instruction weekly.

In May of 2022, 76% of third through sixth grade students will demonstrate proficiency of 3+ on FSA ELA. In May of 2022, 59% of students (from 39%) in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains. Learning gains for all FSA ELA students will increase from 63% to 68%.

Measurable Outcome:

In May of 2022, collaboration amongst all school faculty (ESE, SLPs, Activity, Guidance, Classroom Teachers) will increase. Teachers across grade levels will know student data beyond their own classrooms, will support problem solving in the Individual Problem Solving Team model, select appropriate interventions, plan instruction and work together to monitor student progress. Teachers will increase use of the BPS Decision Trees and the MTSS process to support student learning based on multiple diagnostic data points.

Student data for the lowest 25% will be monitored closely through reporting groups on iReady and PLTs.

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring throughout the school year will show increases from iReady Diagnostic 1 (September/October 2021) to iReady Diagnostic 3 (May 2022).

iReady data will show fidelity with implementation of iReady instruction for 30-45 minutes weekly with the goal of 80% proficiency for every student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenifer Born (born.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Grade level teams and ESE co-teachers implement a school wide Walk to Intervention program. Teachers will meet in Professional Learning Teams weekly to plan intentionally, build capacity as practitioners, and to progress monitor and problem solve and implement effective teaching strategies aligned with students' needs in ELA. Teachers in the school-wide service model will use complex text for differentiation of ELA, will progress monitor weekly using BPS Decision Tree, and problem solve with their PLTs based on student data.

Rationale for

Data for Lewis Carroll Elementary showed that a majority of students struggling academically did not demonstrate learning gains on the FSA ELA. To better meet students'

Evidence-based Strategy:

needs, two additional teachers are being assigned to each grade level to support providing intervention to students. Students will be grouped by their academic needs as determined through multiple data points as outlined in the BPS Decision Tree for every grade level. For each group that is considered below grade level, a research-based intervention will be assigned with a progress monitoring tool. Instructional strategies for intervention/support will be provided in the context of story and with complex text.

Action Steps to Implement**DEFINE/PLAN:**

- Build master schedule to include 30-40 minutes common time for differentiated ELA instruction
- Plan yearlong professional development for implementation of reading interventions
- Teacher teams meet weekly for collaborative planning
- Students meet with assigned teacher daily for differentiated ELA instruction
- Schedule common collaborative planning for ESE and Gen Ed teachers (BPIE)
- Assign instructional staff by specific grade level for differentiated instructional groups
- Identify, place, and track students identified as ELL

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

ANALYZE:

- Gather Data from multiple sources: FSA, FLKRs, iReady, and additional assessment data (PASI, KLS, PSI, DORF)
- Establish reporting groups for iReady to include EWS, SWDs, BGL, SDs, and FRL for progress monitoring
- Identify Lowest 25% of students for every grade level using FSA ELA and iReady Diagnostic
- Update and maintain list of students considered substantially deficient and all students performing below grade level that have been identified using multiple data points. Red folders with MTSS documentation issued to identified students.
- Teacher teams collaborate to analyze data, evaluate student needs, and establish instructional groups
- Incorporate PASI and PSI for progress monitoring as required in the BPS Decision Tree for diagnostic purposes and to plan intervention for students with phonological awareness and phonics needs
- Track data and plan focused discussions during team meetings with general education and exceptional education teachers with admin team facilitating
- Progress monitor students identified as ELL with ELL Team

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

IMPLEMENT:

- Implement intervention and planned progress monitoring for below grade level readers through the MTSS process
- Teacher teams determine instructional focus based on student academic needs, choose interventions based on decision trees, select progress monitoring tools, plan instruction, and gather resources
- Students meet with assigned teacher daily for differentiated ELA instruction
- Students participate in iReady ELA instruction for 30-45 minutes weekly
- Teacher teams meet weekly for collaborative planning

Person Responsible Sandra Kerr (kerr.sandra@brevardschools.org)

EVALUATE:

- Teacher teams meet every four to six weeks with administration and literacy coach for data chats, that include progress monitoring, problem solving, sharing of instructional practices, and evaluating effectiveness of instruction and specific interventions

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>At Lewis Carroll Elementary, student discipline is considered an opportunity to learn. When misbehavior occurs, students are asked to take responsibility for the behavior, to make amends, and to make a new action plan to avoid the behavior in the future. Students with discipline referrals are assigned corrective strategies that align with the BPS Discipline Plan. Managing student misbehavior is a reactive practice; it occurs after there has been misbehavior. While Lewis Carroll does have Tier 1 schoolwide lifeskills instruction in place for all, there is a need for increased proactive implementation of Tier 1 behavior supports.</p> <p>Compared to the state discipline data, Lewis Carroll's discipline incidents are slightly lower and less severe than the overall state's average. Lewis Carroll reports 1.3 incidents per 100 students, compared to the states of 2.5 incidents per 100 students each year. Out of the 1,395 elementary schools statewide, Lewis Carroll is ranked 1,082nd. Lewis Carroll is also ranked 47th out of 56 elementary schools in the county. The primary areas of concern are fighting and bullying. Both are a result of students having difficulty managing interpersonal conflict. Establishing new procedures for conflict resolution is important.</p> <p>Conscious Discipline has been added to the schoolwide social emotional learning plan as a Tier 1 strategy to help improve school and classroom community and promote social emotional learning for adults and students in order to strengthen the school culture. Stronger relationships will be the foundation for conflict resolution in a problem solving Conscious Discipline model. Lewis Carroll Elementary School is in its second year of implementation of Conscious Discipline and is considered a BPS Anchor School.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>By May 2022, discipline referrals school-wide will decline and SafeSchoolsforAlex.org will report that discipline referrals for 2021-2022 dropped from 1.3 per 100 students to 1.0 per 100.</p> <p>By May 2022, the classrooms of Lewis Carroll Elementary will include practices aligned with Conscious Discipline such as Safe Space, classroom rituals, brain breaks, Wishing Well, and class meetings. A paradigm shift will continue to occur and the adults at Lewis Carroll Elementary will develop mindsets that perceive misbehavior as communication.</p> <p>Rtl:B will be completed for every discipline referral submitted to administration. Admin will meet to problem solve Rtl:B data monthly. Rtl:B data will be shared with staff quarterly for action planning and problem solving purposes.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Additional supports will be put in place for individual students as the need arises. Students of concern will be discussed with the Threat Assessment Team and the IPST process will begin when necessary. District Behavior Analysts will be consulted when appropriate. Classroom observations and teacher feedback will include elements of CD implementation.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Sandra Kerr (kerr.sandra@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Implement year two Conscious Discipline professional development and implement the recommended strategies to build stronger class families with all students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-	<p>Research supports the implementation of Conscious Discipline and it is a Brevard Public Schools initiative aligned with the BPS Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Implementation of SEL programs has resulted in significant improvements in school</p>

based Strategy: environments, student learning, and academic performance, as well as reductions in negative behaviors (CASEL, 2007; Kramer, Caldarella, Christensen, & Shatzer, 2010; Zins, Weissberg, Want, & Walbert, 2004), SEL programs promote positive behaviors such as kindness and caring, while discouraging problem behaviors such as bullying and violence (CASEL, 2007; Whitcomb, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development during preplanning, monthly trainings, six designated early release training and a book study.

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

Model/teach concepts of Conscious Discipline with students and staff through daily announcements.

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

Infuse Conscious Discipline theory in processes related to student discipline. Use the framework of discipline as an opportunity to apply the concepts in real life scenarios.

Person Responsible Sandra Kerr (kerr.sandra@brevardschools.org)

Implement strategies from Conscious Discipline in classrooms to strengthen classroom community; establish rituals such as class meetings, brain breaks, Wishing Well, and Safe Place.

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

Meet with Conscious Discipline Action Team to plan school-wide training and professional development.

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

Seek feedback and mentoring from Conscious Discipline trainer for four sessions of face to face practice with CDAT members. Discuss implementation with trainer for six hour long sessions for problem solving throughout school year.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Compared to the state discipline data, Lewis Carroll's discipline incidents are slightly lower and less severe than the overall state's average.

Lewis Carroll reports 1.3 incidents per 100 students, compared to the states of 2.5 incidents per 100 students each year. Out of the 1,395 elementary schools statewide, Lewis Carroll is ranked 1,082nd. Lewis Carroll is also ranked 47th out of 56 elementary schools in the county.

Primary area of concern: Fighting

Secondary area of concern: Bullying

Conscious Discipline has been added to the schoolwide discipline plan to help improve school and classroom community, promoting SEL among the school culture. During the 20-21 school year, 6th grade showed an increase in behaviors due to having activity, recess, and lunch times consecutively in the master schedule and the time was mostly unstructured. This year a change was made to separate learning times and arrange unstructured time periodically throughout the day to help elevate the behavior issues. According to the discipline data as of October 2021, behaviors in 6th grade have decreased.

Strategies for improving student discipline schoolwide:

- * Prioritize the use of evidence-based prevention strategies, such as tiered supports, to promote positive student behavior.**
 - * Provide regular training and supports to all school personnel; including teachers, administration, and support staff on how to engage students and support positive behavior.**
 - * Promote social and emotional learning to complement academic skills and encourage positive behavior.**
 - * Using Conscious Discipline to engage in deliberate efforts to create positive school climates.**
 - * Universal supports are provided to all students, prior to any display of disruptive behavior.**
- These supports set expectations for behavior in all areas of the school and throughout the entire school day.**

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.

In the YouthTruth Survey from 2021 measure of Relationships, 82% of the students in 3rd grade through 6th grade chose the highest level of three as their answer. In the same survey, 90% of the students rated the questions for Engagement a three. This would indicate that the relationships between teachers and students are strong and students feel a high sense of engagement while learning. In the Insight Survey from Winter 2021, 84% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that working collaboratively with their school teams was productive. Cohesiveness in the faculty at LC is an important foundation for a positive school culture and environment.

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. Last year, we implemented Conscious Discipline for Social-Emotional Learning for grade K-6 and now we are in year two of implementation. As we continue on this new journey our stakeholders will begin learning about this framework alongside us.

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

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 Elementary 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 two-way dialog for problem solving

Two way dialog and problem solving will continue to be of utmost importance. As problems are identified and problem solved, practices will be developed and plans will be implemented with fidelity. Trust and transparency, along with regular communication are the foundation of this plan.