

Brevard Public Schools

Lewis Carroll Elementary School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	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: 9/25/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (58%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">39%</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;">21%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A	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.

Developing respectful citizens through an engaging and caring learning environment that maximizes academic achievement and personal growth for all. (Revised 2021-22)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we will achieve greatness! (Revised 2021-22)

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Born, Jenifer	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Monitor and manage school security with Threat Assessment Team Manage Conscious Discipline Action Team, School Improvement Plan Team, Leadership Team Facilitate, participate and provide feedback for Professional Learning Teams 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
Kerr, Sandra	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Engage in Threat Assessment Team activities and problem solving Collaborate with Leadership Team for problem solving Administer BPS Discipline Policy Manage, evaluate and provide feedback to teachers in the New Teacher Induction Program Create, implement and manage all school schedules Coordinate and implement school school-wide testing Manage, supervise, and evaluate the Academic Support Program Facilitate, participate and provide feedback for Professional Learning Teams Publish 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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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 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 Engage in Threat Assessment Team activities and problem solving

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/25/2017, Jami Miner L

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

627

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	79	77	84	101	82	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	617
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	8	12	9	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	3	6	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	7	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	6	6	6	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	5	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	61%	56%				74%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						68%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						57%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	78%	49%	50%				78%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						70%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						63%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	60%	59%				60%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	64%	14%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2022					
	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	51	49	39	59	71	67	38				
HSP	79	71		82	80						
MUL	70	54		57	69						
WHT	75	64	41	80	70	62	56				
FRL	67	58	39	68	64	56	49				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	78
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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	64
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 six years: 75 (2022), 71, 74, 70, 74, 72. Over the last six years, the percentage of students with learning gains in ELA overall were: 64 (2022), 63, 68, 55, 61, and 63. Scores for proficiency in mathematics are also in the seventies for the last six years: 75 (2022), 73, 78, 76, 72, 72. For learning gains in math the scores were 63 (2022), 45, 63, 49, 53, 48. In science, the scores have been inconsistent for the last six years 56 (2022), 64, 60, 48, 78, 62.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning Gains for the lowest 25% demonstrated the greatest need overall in ELA. Only 42% of the students at Lewis Carroll Elementary in the lowest 25% showed learning gains in ELA an increase from 39% in 2021. Learning gains overall for ELA were 64 (2022), 63, 68, 55, 61, 63.

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

All students, especially students in the lowest 25%, need consistent progress monitoring and differentiated, scaffolded instruction to meet their academic needs in ELA. Last year, the percentage of learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 39% (2021) to 42% (2022). In years past, the percentage was 57, 43, 45, 53. The new actions taken to address this need are an increased focus on implementing walk to intervention school wide for Tier 2 intervention, MTSS/IPST problem solving, and the use of diagnostic assessments to align instruction with students' needs aligned with the BPS Reading Plan. New actions include greater support from the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) and our Individual Problem Solving Team (ISPT) team to support success of MTSS/IPST problem solving, diagnosis, and intervention. Additionally, ELA professional development will support LC teachers implementing the interventions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Of the seven indicators for school grade, all indicators increased except for science. The greatest improvements were in mathematics. Students have returned to school full time and their math skills thrived with consistent face to face instruction and achievement gaps were filled. Overall proficiency in ELA increased from 71% to 75%, mathematics increased from 73% to 78%. Learning gains overall in ELA increased from 63% to 64% and in math the greatest increase from 45% to 63%.

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

The greatest increase was in mathematics overall at LC. Increased learning gains from 45% to 63% is a significant increase. Contextually, scores over the last six years in this cell were 63 (2022), 45, 63, 49, 53, and 48.

A greater focus on teaching to the full intent of the standards supported by collaboration with colleagues has had an impact on instruction and overall scores. Teachers at LC focused on teaching math to mastery using formative assessments and reteaching based on data. Proficiency over the six years in math yielded scores of 71, 57 (2021), 70, 63, 63, 63,

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

In our second year of a new ELA curriculum with new standards, teachers and students will have a better understanding of the systems and this will increase engagement, teacher clarity, and rigor. In addition, PD in ELA PLTs (professional learning teams) will be provided monthly by the literacy coach. Trainings will support the BPS Reading Plan aligned with the Science of Reading and building teacher collective efficacy will support student achievement in ELA. We believe that these new supports will accelerate student learning. Additionally, the teachers will continue to 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.

PD in ELA PLTs (professional learning teams) will be provided monthly by the literacy coach. Trainings will support the BPS Reading Plan aligned with the Science of Reading. Building teacher collective efficacy will support student achievement in ELA. We believe that these new supports will accelerate student learning.

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

Overall mental health and wellness has been impacted during the pandemic and our staff and students are benefiting from training we are receiving in Conscious Discipline (CD). A foundation of community and strong relationships with and among colleagues and students is the environment in which our staff and students will continue to thrive. We believe we are all in this together and we are committed to excellence. We are in year three and are a Conscious Discipline anchor school for the district. This focus on CD 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 2022-2023, our staff and faculty will engage in a book study supported by online instruction through webinars provided by Becky Bailey focused on Conscious Discipline. We will have four onsite visits by a certified instructor and four administrator coaching sessions along with two days of in person professional development with a certified instructor.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Learning Gains for the lowest 25% demonstrated the greatest need overall in ELA. Only 42% of the students at Lewis Carroll Elementary in the lowest 25% showed learning gains in ELA an increase from 39% in 2021. Learning gains overall for ELA were 64 (2022), 63, 68, 55, 61, 63. The new actions taken to address this need are an increased focus on implementing walk to intervention school wide for Tier 2 intervention, MTSS/IPST problem solving, and the use of diagnostic assessments to align instruction with students' needs aligned with the BPS Reading Plan. All students, especially students in the lowest 25%, need consistent progress monitoring and differentiated, scaffolded instruction to meet their academic needs in ELA.

For year two of implementation, our goal continues to be focused on increasing reading proficiency for all students...

- by providing professional development on the major reading components, administration and analysis of instructional assessments, and providing differentiated instruction and intervention to meet student needs.
- by meeting in PLTs to analyze student data, problem solve, and plan for interventions and progress monitoring based on the BPS Decision Trees.
- by identifying teacher support needs through ELA focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher surveys, and PLT meetings.
- by supporting teacher needs via coaching, modeling, team planning, and PD to practice.
- by increasing interventionist/teacher support by LLT and IPST for problem solving, diagnosis, intervention, and documentation.

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

In May of 2023, 80% of third through sixth grade students will demonstrate proficiency of 3+ on FSA ELA. In May of 2023, 52% of students (from 42%) in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains. Learning gains for all FSA ELA students will increase from 64% to 69%.

In May of 2023, collaboration amongst all school faculty (ESE, SLPs, Activity, Guidance, Classroom Teachers) will continue to 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.

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

Monitoring:
 Student data (STAR/FAST progress monitoring assesments and iReady) for the lowest 25% will be monitored closely and individual problem solving will take place during PLTs and MTSS meetings.

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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Grade level teams and ESE co-teachers implement a school wide intervention program. Teachers will meet in Professional Learning Teams to plan intentionally, ELA PD provided throughout year will support teachers providing intervention by building capacity as practitioners to progress monitor, problem solve, and implement effective teaching strategies aligned with students' needs in ELA. Teachers in the schoolwide service model will provide Tier 2 intervention for ELA, progress monitor weekly using BPS Decision Tree, and problem solve with their PLTs based on student data. Literacy Leadership Team will support from PD to practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Data for Lewis Carroll Elementary showed that a majority of students struggling academically did not demonstrate learning gains on the FSA ELA for the second year (lowest 25%). To better meet students' needs, 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. Support will be provided by the Literacy Leadership Team and Individual Problem Solving Teams to support intervention and data tracking and documentation. Teachers find the MTSS/IPST models overwhelming and the goal is to provide greater support for them with the understanding that we are all in this together.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- by providing professional development on the major reading components, administration and analysis of instructional assessments, and providing differentiated instruction and intervention to meet student needs.
- by meeting in PLTs to analyze student data, problem solve, and plan for interventions and progress monitoring based on the BPS Decision Trees.
- by identifying teacher support needs through ELA focused classroom walkthroughs, teacher surveys, and PLT meetings.
- by supporting teacher needs via coaching, modeling, team planning, and PD to practice.

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

Person Responsible

Jenifer Born (born.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

ANALYZE:

- Gather Data from multiple sources: FSA, STAR, FAST, 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 each grade level using FSA, STAR, FAST, and iReady ELA Data
- 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 teachers for 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

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Conscious Discipline-SEL-Lifeskills Instruction

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.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: UPDATE THIS 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. NEEDS UPDATE!

The primary areas of concerns are fighting and bullying. Both are a result of students having difficulty managing interpersonal conflict. Establishing new procedures for conflict resolution is important. 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.

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

By May 2023, 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. Monitoring: 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

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for

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.

the desired outcome. Classroom observations and teacher feedback will include elements of CD implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sandra Kerr (kerr.sandra@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Implement year three Conscious Discipline professional development and implement the recommended strategies to build stronger class families with all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. Research supports the implementation of Conscious Discipline and it is a Brevard Public Schools initiative aligned with the BPS Strategic Plan. Implementation of SEL programs has resulted in significant improvements in school 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development during preplanning, monthly trainings, six - eight designated early release trainings using Conscious Discipline Building Resilient Schools and Homes 10 session webinar series by Becky Bailey, four in person coaching days for Conscious Discipline Action Team, two Professional Development Days with Master Certified Instructor from CD, four administrative coaching sessions with Master Certified Instructor, and continued 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 four hour long sessions for problem solving throughout school year.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At LC, we are a Conscious Discipline Anchor School and a Glasser Quality School committed to strengthening class and school families to build resiliency with a focus 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.

In the YouthTruth Survey from 2022 measure of Relationships, 75% of the students in 3rd grade through 6th grade chose the highest level of three as their answer. In the same survey, 86% 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. The two highest rated themes were Belonging and Culture with the highest rated question, "Do you think your teacher cares about you?" The lowest rated themes were Instructional Methods and Academic Challenge. Students feel they "learn a lot in their classes" but they feel that the content isn't interesting and they aren't sure how their learning helps them outside of school. In the Insight survey, teachers shared that 84% believe that the academic standards for their grade level are rigorous and that students have many opportunities for academic discussions. Analyzing this feedback to better understand our students' perspectives will help us to make improvements to better support our learners.

In the Insight Survey from Winter 2022, the school index increased to 7.9. 93% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that working collaboratively with their school teams was productive. 93% believe that their colleagues set an example of what highly effective teaching looks like. 76% believe that the school is committed to improving their instructional practices. 73% believe that the school is a good place to teach and learn. Cohesiveness in the faculty at LC is an important foundation for a positive school culture and environment.

Parent Survey Results showed that 89% are satisfied with the relationship they have with the school principal and 85% of our families feel welcome on the school campus. Responses expressed that communication was good and most rely on Class Dojo, email, flyers, and teacher notes to get information about school happenings. Parent survey results showed that our parents would like more evening opportunities to be available for support with their children's academic programs, managing behaviors at home, and family fun. Also, only 59% shared that they feel their voice is heard in school decisions. Our staff is committed to increasing those opportunities for our families.

Survey data from students, teachers, and parents helps inform decision making and all stakeholders are made aware of how their feedback impacts the way of our work. The goal at Lewis Carroll Elementary is to honor feedback without being defensive, dismissive, feeling dejected, or downplaying the negative. All feedback is an opportunity to learn and improve. It helps us to better understand teachers', students', and parents' perspectives and that is so very important. We are committed to continuous improvement and the voices of all stakeholders matter. The vision of the school is "Together we will achieve greatness!" and that is our collective commitment.

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

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
- 4) Plan more opportunities to include families through volunteering and after hours events

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

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.

SAC - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation).

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests.

A clear code of conduct for students and school wide agreements for adults with input from students, families, and school personnel have been created.

Lewis Carroll Elementary School Code of Conduct includes:

Be Attentive - Listen to Understand

Be Caring - Show kindness for others with your words and actions

Be Responsible - Take responsibility for what you say and do

Be Respectful - Show respect for all people and all things

School Wide Agreements

- Have fun – Seek fun

- Be impeccable with your word

- Have positive intent with ourselves and others

Never take anything personally – QTIP Quit Taking It Personally

Never make assumptions – Seek to understand by asking for more information

- Trust one another - Ask for support when you need it – We are all in this together

- Do your best

Lewis Carroll Elementary School has a positive culture as a result of intentional solution-based problem solving and a commitment to relationship building. Our students thrive because of the commitment from all stakeholders to the mission "Developing respectful citizens through an engaging and caring learning environment that maximizes academic achievement and personal growth for all."