

Brevard Public Schools

# Lewis Carroll Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>12</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>17</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## Lewis Carroll Elementary School

1 SKYLINE BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32953

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Miner, Jami         | Principal           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Oversee all focus areas, action steps, and monitoring of the overall School Improvement Plan.</li> <li>-Establish monitoring schedule to ensure the implementation of the SIP.</li> <li>-Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to identify evidence of plan alignment.</li> <li>-Hold monthly data meetings to inspect data trends and brainstorm action steps.</li> <li>-Collect evidence of alignment and showcase when possible (teachers observing others, etc.)</li> <li>-Provide teachers will actionable feedback to better align practices to those outlined in the SIP.</li> <li>-Use evidence and artifacts to make adjustments if appropriate to SIP with stakeholder feedback.</li> <li>-Communicate with appropriate stakeholders about our goals and milestones.</li> <li>-Provide regularly scheduled Professional Learning Team (PLT) sessions for teachers to engage in professional learning.</li> <li>-Conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure the implementation of the adopted curriculum in ELA, Math, and Science.</li> <li>-Provide regularly scheduled data meetings to discuss student progression and identify trends.</li> <li>-Schedule Professional Development Opportunities focused around ELA, Math, and Science.</li> </ul> |
| Kerr, Sandra        | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Master Schedule management.</li> <li>-Provide teachers access to adopted curriculum and inventory management.</li> <li>-Provide access and training on district pacing guide.</li> <li>-Secure required district assessments for teachers.</li> <li>-Conduct walkthroughs and feedback to teachers.</li> <li>-Secure intervention materials needed (from the decision tree).</li> <li>-Plan/Secure professional development opportunities to support Science instruction.</li> <li>-Monitor the use of PENDA Science in Grades 3-6.</li> <li>-Secure consumables to support hands on science and the 5E model.</li> </ul>   |
| Davis-King, Jessica | Instructional Coach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Conduct regularly scheduled MTSS/Data meetings.</li> <li>-Conduct regular walkthroughs to observe the implementation of interventions.</li> <li>-Provide professional development opportunities for intervention materials and processes.</li> <li>-Monitor intervention data on share drive (required forms).</li> <li>-Access to decision trees and resources for intervention.</li> </ul>  |
| JAMES, SARAH        | Teacher, K-12       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support K-6 Science Instruction by providing ongoing professional development for teachers as needed.</li> </ul>  |

| Name         | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------|----------------|---|
|              |                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Establish a model classroom for teacher observation.</li> <li>-Coach teachers on the implementation of science curriculum an resources.</li> </ul>  |
| Baez, Manuel | Teacher, K-12  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide surveys and review student / family culture surveys and data.</li> <li>-Develop and lead student mentor program.</li> <li>-Consult with guidance/ school stakeholders to identify students in need of mentoring.</li> <li>-Act as a participant of the Parent and Family Involvement Committee</li> </ul> |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

School Advisory Council: Draft SIP and school data to be presented at SAC meeting and stakeholder feedback collected.

School Improvement Plan Committee developed (This included leadership positions as well as teacher representatives) to work together to develop the 2023-2024 SIP.

Lewis Carroll Elementary is dedicated to providing a top-notch educational experience to our students as well as our families, to include the opportunity for multiple stakeholder voices to be heard as well as their feedback to be considered in the development of the School Improvement Plan.

Teacher/Staff survey data indicated:  
 A need for clearer communication (78.3%)  
 Stronger school management (69.6%)  
 Stronger school-based decision making (34.8%).

Students participated in the annual Youth Truth Survey. Results indicated:  
 A decrease in Student Engagement (92% in 2020) to (82% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Academic Challenge (46% in 2020) to (36% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Relationships (78% in 2020) to (70% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Instructional Methods (54% in 2020) to (45% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 An increase in Culture (14% in 2020) to (17% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.

Parent survey data indicated:  
 A need for clearer communication.  
 A need for consistent discipline.  
 A need for more events for students.



**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored by following the established steps:

1. Establish Monitoring Schedule:

- Create a calendar outlining regular monitoring activities throughout the school year.
- Schedule quarterly reviews to assess progress and effectiveness (this is to include SIP committee members).

2. Class Walkthroughs:

- Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs by administrators to observe teaching methods, student engagement, and alignment with the plan's goals.
- Use standardized rubrics to provide consistent feedback and identify areas for improvement.

3. Teacher Data Team Meetings:

- Hold monthly teacher data team meetings to analyze student performance data.
- Discuss trends, patterns, and areas of concern, and brainstorm strategies for improvement.

4. Professional Learning Teams:

- Collaborate with area experts (Literacy Coach, District Math Coach, District MTSS Coach and others) to build skillset.
- Collaboratively explore best practices, share resources, and develop targeted interventions.

5. Evidence Collection:

- Collect evidence of effective implementation through classroom artifacts, lesson plans, and student work showcasing alignment with the plan's goals.

6. Data Analysis:

- Regularly analyze assessment data from various sources, including Fast PM, Renaissance, iReady, and Exit Tickets.
- Identify growth trends, achievement gaps, and areas needing attention.

7. Feedback and Reflection:

- Provide timely feedback to teachers and staff based on classroom walkthroughs.
- Encourage self-reflection and self-assessment to drive continuous improvement.

8. Revision Process:

- Engage in periodic reviews of the improvement plan to assess its effectiveness.
- Use feedback from walkthroughs, data team meetings, and data analysis to identify necessary adjustments.

9. Stakeholder Involvement:

- Involve teachers, School Improvement Plan Committee, SAC, and other stakeholders in the development and/or revision of the plan.
- Gather feedback through surveys, focus groups, and meetings to gain different perspectives.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 21%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 39%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | N/A  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br><br>2019-20: A<br><br>2018-19: A<br><br>2017-18: B   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

## Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 11          | 8  | 8  | 13 | 9 | 9  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 67 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 2  | 4  | 1 | 2  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 20 |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2 | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 6  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 5 | 16 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 30 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1 | 9  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 15 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 12 | 17 | 16 | 4 | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 55 |       |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 23    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 6           | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6     |

#### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |    |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|----|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9  | 4 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 50 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 1           | 3 | 6 | 3  | 1  | 1 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 19 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 7           | 3 | 0 | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 13 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 5  | 5 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 15 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 12 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 29 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 8           | 6 | 6 | 6  | 5  | 3 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 39 |       |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 18    |

The number of students identified retained:

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

#### Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |    |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|----|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9  | 4 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 50 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 1           | 3 | 6 | 3  | 1  | 1 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 19 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 7           | 3 | 0 | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 13 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 5  | 5 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 15 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 12 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 29 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 8           | 6 | 6 | 6  | 5  | 3 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 39 |       |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 18    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

### ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component    | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*            | 71     | 58       | 53    | 75     | 61       | 56    | 71     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 64     |          |       | 63     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 42     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 71     | 58       | 59    | 78     | 49       | 50    | 73     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 71     |          |       | 57     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 63     |          |       | 45     |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement*            | 61     | 58       | 54    | 56     | 60       | 59    | 64     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 64       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 51       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 56       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 54       | 59    |        |          |       |        |          |       |

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 69  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 275 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 4   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 98  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 64  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 449 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 97  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| <b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 64                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       | 65                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 71                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 57                                     |                           |  |  |

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 53                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 78                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       | 63                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 64                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 57                                     |                           |  |  |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 71       |        |             | 71        |         |              | 61       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 43       |        |             | 56        |         |              | 38       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 74       |        |             | 79        |         |              | 44       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| MUL  | 65       |        |             | 65        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 70       |        |             | 71        |         |              | 68       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 64       |        |             | 61        |         |              | 52       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 75       | 64     | 42          | 78        | 71      | 63           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 51       | 49     | 39          | 59        | 71      | 67           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 79       | 71     |             | 82        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 70       | 54     |             | 57        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 75       | 64     | 41          | 80        | 70      | 62           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 67       | 58     | 39          | 68        | 64      | 56           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 71       | 63     | 39          | 73        | 57      | 45           | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 49       | 52     | 45          | 52        | 52      | 35           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 27       |        |             | 27        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 70       | 71     |             | 68        | 57      | 55           |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 61       |        |             | 61        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 72       | 62     | 43          | 74        | 58      | 48           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 59       | 55     | 25          | 57        | 46      | 36           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 76%    | 59%      | 17%                        | 54%   | 22%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 64%    | 61%      | 3%                         | 58%   | 6%                      |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 68%    | 61%      | 7%                         | 47%   | 21%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 68%    | 56%      | 12%                        | 50%   | 18%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 86%    | 67%      | 19%                        | 54%   | 32%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 78%    | 60%      | 18%                        | 59%   | 19%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 74%    | 61%      | 13%                        | 61%   | 13%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 55%      | 0%                         | 55%   | 0%                      |



| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 61%    | 57%      | 4%                         | 51%   | 10%                     |

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science at 61% achievement (10% over the state average of 51%).

ELA proficiency was at 69% achievement.

Math proficiency was at 73%, achievement.

ELA (STATE/DISTRICT/SCHOOL)

3rd Grade 50/56/68 - Outperformed the state by 18% and the district by 12%.

4th Grade 58/61/64 - Outperformed the state by 6% and the district by 3%.

5th Grade 52/59/76 - Outperformed the state by 24% and the district by 17%.

6th Grade 47/61/68 - Outperformed the state by 21% and the district by 7%.

MATH (STATE/DISTRICT/SCHOOL)

3rd Grade 59/60/78 - Outperformed the state by 19% and the district by 18%.

4th Grade 61/61/74 - Outperformed the state by 13% and the district by 13%.

5th Grade 55/55/55 - Outperformed the state by 0% and the district by 0%.

6th Grade 54/67/86 - Outperformed the state by 32% and the district by 19%.

SCIENCE (STATE/DISTRICT/SCHOOL)

5th Grade 51/57/61 - Outperformed the state by 10% and the district by 4%.

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

The 2023 ELA Achievement (69%) showed the greatest decline from the 2022 ELA Achievement (75%). Lack of student mastery of the new Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) may have contributed to the decline in student achievement.

Possible factors for the low performance include early warning indicators of multiple students with attendance below 90%.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Lewis Carroll continues to outperform in ELA, Math, and Science achievement when compared to the state. However, the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile scored 42% (10 points below the state average of 52%) in 2022, providing evidence that intervention models for our substantially deficient students should be research based and consistent.

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

The 2023 Science Achievement score climbed to a 61% (10 points higher than the state average of 51%). This number is also 1% higher than the pre-covid score of 60%. This is the only component to exceed the 2019 achievement scores at Lewis Carroll (pre-covid).

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

67/627 (11%) of current students have an EWS for attendance below 90%.

55/627 (9%) of current students have an EWS for Substantial Reading Deficiency.

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

Priority 1: Align instructional practices in ELA to focus around the Benchmarks for Student Thinking (B.E.S.T) which are grounded in the Science of Reading to improve overall ELA Achievement in Grades K-6.

Priority 2: Align instructional practices in Math to focus around the Benchmarks for Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) to improve overall Math Achievement in Grades K-6.

Priority 3: Implement consistent interventions for students who are deficient in ELA using research-based intervention tools.

Priority 4: Align K-6 instructional practices in Science to focus around the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) to improve Science Achievement in Grade 5.

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA Achievement for the 2022-2023 school year showed the biggest decline in achievement falling from 75% achievement in 2021-2022 to 69% in 2022-2023.

**1. Professional Development:**

- Conduct comprehensive training sessions for teachers on Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) adopted curriculum as needed.
- Teacher supports needed will be identified through ELA focused walkthroughs, teacher surveys, and Professional Learning Team (PLT) discussions.
- Teacher supports will be provided including but not limited to coaching, modeling, team planning, and continuous professional development.

**2. Curriculum Integration:**

- Align the instruction with the Benchmarks for Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) to ensure comprehensive coverage by using adopted Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) curriculum.

**3. Student Discourse:**

- Encourage teachers to incorporate structured discussions, group activities, and peer interactions in lessons.

**4. Corrective Feedback and Scaffolding:**

- Encourage teachers to provide timely and specific feedback to students to address misconceptions and encourage growth.
- Promote the use of scaffolding techniques to support struggling learners and challenge advanced students appropriately outlined in Benchmark Advance.

**5. Mastery of Grade-Level Standards:**

- Adhere to district pacing guides that outline the progression of standards throughout the school year, ensuring adequate time for mastery.

**6. Assessment and Data Analysis:**

- Administer district assessments as outlined in the district pacing guide to measure student progression and identify areas of improvement.

**7. Timely Action on Assessment Results:**

- Identify students who require additional support or enrichment based on assessment outcomes.

**9. Collaborative Planning:**

- Encourage regular collaborative planning sessions for teachers to share effective practices, discuss challenges, and brainstorm solutions.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

On the May 2024 FAST Assessment, overall ELA Achievement will increase from 69% in 2023 back to 75% achievement as recorded in 2022 (the highest achievement score recorded at Lewis Carroll since

2019).

Students will show steady progression from PM1, to PM2, showing accelerated achievement on PM3.

### **Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will attend Professional Learning Teams focused around ELA and implement their learnings into practice. Regular walkthroughs will be conducted to observe the implementation of Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) and other strategies learned in PLTs in regard to ELA instruction. Regular walkthroughs and discussions will occur to discuss ways to assist in the implementation of Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6). Data meetings will be held regularly to analyze student assessment results and determine trends to drive instruction. Professional Development opportunities will be modified and provided based on stakeholder feedback. Evidence of Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) will be observed regularly in the classroom setting.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jami Miner (miner.jami@brevardschools.org)

### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Grade level teams will meet regularly with the Literacy Coach and other support personnel (if needed) to plan for effective Tier 1 instruction using the adopted curriculum Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) which is aligned with the Benchmarks for Student Thinking and grounded in the Science of Reading. The full implementation of Benchmark Advance (K-5) / Savaas (6) will better prepare our students for the FAST Assessment which will assess Benchmark for Student Thinking.

Core Instruction (Tier 1): provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, and corrective feedback; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading;

### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To better prepare students for the FAST Assessment which assesses Benchmarks for Student Thinking, regular PLTs will provide ample opportunities for teachers to engage in professional conversations about the curriculum, pacing guides, student data, and instructional practices in ELA.

Florida's Formula for Success (Rule 6A-6.053(9)(a), F.A.C.)

K-12 reading instruction will align with Florida's Formula for Success.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **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.

Master Schedule to reflect uninterrupted 90 minute reading block (K-6) Regularly scheduled PLT meetings.

Access to adopted curriculum.

Access to pacing guides.

Access to district assessments.

Regular walkthroughs and feedback cycles.

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

**By When:** PLTs scheduled for the 2023-2024 school year by Aug. 31, 2023. Access to other items - immediate.

Access to Professional Development (as needed).

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

**By When:** As Needed

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math Achievement for the 2022-2023 school year showed the 2nd biggest decline in achievement falling from 78% achievement in 2021-2022 to 73% in 2022-2023.

#### 1. Professional Development:

- Conduct comprehensive training sessions for teachers on Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) adopted curriculum as needed.
- Teacher supports needed will be identified through Math focused walkthroughs, teacher surveys, and Professional Learning Team (PLT) discussions.
- Teacher supports will be provided including but not limited to coaching, modeling, team planning, and continuous professional development.

#### 2. Curriculum Integration:

- Align the instruction with the Benchmarks for Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) to ensure comprehensive coverage by using adopted Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) curriculum.

#### 3. Student Discourse:

- Encourage teachers to incorporate structured discussions, group activities, and peer interactions in lessons.

#### 4. Corrective Feedback and Scaffolding:

- Encourage teachers to provide timely and specific feedback to students to address misconceptions and encourage growth.
- Promote the use of scaffolding techniques to support struggling learners and challenge advanced students appropriately outlined in Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6).

#### 5. Mastery of Grade-Level Standards:

- Adhere to district pacing guides that outline the progression of standards throughout the school year, ensuring adequate time for mastery.

#### 6. Assessment and Data Analysis:

- Administer district assessments as outlined in the district pacing guide to measure student progression and identify areas of improvement.

#### 7. Timely Action on Assessment Results:

- Identify students who require additional support or enrichment based on assessment outcomes.

#### 9. Collaborative Planning:

- Encourage regular collaborative planning sessions for teachers to share effective practices, discuss challenges, and brainstorm solutions.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

On the May 2024 FAST Assessment, overall Math Achievement will increase from 73% in 2023 back to 78% achievement as recorded in 2022 (the highest achievement score recorded at Lewis Carroll, which was also reflected in 2019).

Students will show steady progression from PM1, to PM2, showing accelerated achievement on PM3.

### **Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will attend Professional Learning Teams focused around Math with the district math coach and implement their learnings into practice. Regular walkthroughs will be conducted to observe the implementation of Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) and other strategies learned in PLTs in regard to Math instruction. Regular walkthroughs and discussions will occur to discuss ways to assist in the implementation of Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6). Data meetings will be held regularly to analyze student assessment results and determine trends to drive instruction. Professional Development opportunities will be modified and provided based on stakeholder feedback. Evidence of Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) will be observed regularly in the classroom setting.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jami Miner (miner.jami@brevardschools.org)

### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Grade level teams will meet regularly with the district math coach and other support personnel (if needed) to plan for effective Tier 1 instruction using the adopted curriculum Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) which is aligned with the Benchmarks for Student Thinking. The full implementation of Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6) will better prepare our students for the FAST Assessment which will assess Benchmark for Student Thinking.

Teachers will engage in Explicit, Systematic Instruction using Reveal Math (K-5) / EdGems (6). to include teacher modeling, teacher "think aloud" and discussions, opportunities for student practice (guided and independent), students verbalizing their thinking, and opportunities for students to make corrections based on teacher feedback.

### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To better prepare students for the FAST Assessment which assesses Benchmarks for Student Thinking, regular PLTs will provide ample opportunities for teachers to engage in professional conversations about the curriculum, pacing guides, student data, and instructional practices in Math.

Research has indicated that teaching using explicit and systematic instruction in mathematics is highly effective and can significantly improve a student's ability to perform mathematical operations (e.g., adding, multiplying, finding the square root) as well as to solve word problems.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **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.

Regularly scheduled PLT meetings.

Access to adopted curriculum.

Access to pacing guides.

Access to district assessments.

Regular walkthroughs and feedback cycles.

**Person Responsible:** Jami Miner (miner.jami@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** PLTs scheduled for the 2023-2024 school year by Aug. 31, 2023. Access to other items - immediate.



### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SWD (25/52 or 48%) ELA Achievement  
 SWD (33/52 or 63%) Math Achievement  
 30/627 Level 1 ELA in Grades 3-6  
 15/627 Level 1 Math in Grades 3-6  
 55/627 Identified as Substantially Deficient in Grades K-6.

Effectively prioritize interventions based on BPS instructional agreements.

1. Assessment: Use available assessment data to identify students who require the most support.
2. Grouping: Strategically group students based on their needs and the interventions required.
3. Resources: Utilize the resources identified on the most current version of the BPS Intervention Decision Tree that align with the specific needs of each group. Ensure that the resources are approved for use to address the targeted areas of need.
4. Intervention Frequency: Implement interventions five days a week to provide consistent and focused support.
5. Monitoring: Continuously monitor the progress of each group. Collect data on their performance and response to interventions on appropriate MTSS forms.
6. Effectiveness Analysis: Attend scheduled MTSS meetings prepared to analyze the collected data to determine the effectiveness of the interventions. Compare students' progress before and after the interventions.
7. Adjustments: Based on the effectiveness analysis, make timely adjustments to the intervention groups if needed. Some groups might require different strategies or resources to improve outcomes.
8. Communication: Maintain open communication with the MTSS team and other appropriate stakeholders.
9. Documentation: Keep detailed records of the interventions, assessment results, adjustments made, and students' progress. This documentation will be valuable for future planning and evaluation if needed.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase SWD ELA Achievement from 48% in Grades 3-6 to 62%.  
 Increase SWD Math Achievement from 63% in Grades 3-6 to 73%.  
 Decrease the number of substantially deficient students in Grades K-6 prior to the 2024-2025 school year as reflected in progress monitoring and assessment data (Renaissance in K-2 & FAST Assessment 3-6).

#### Monitoring:

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

Teachers will attend regularly scheduled MTSS/Data Meetings to discuss student needs and student progression. Regular walkthroughs will be conducted to observe the implementation intervention materials

during "WIN" time (Intervention Block) (Admin). Professional Development opportunities will be modified and provided based on stakeholder feedback. Evidence of student intervention will be documented in the share drive.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Grade level teams will participate in regular MTSS/Data meetings to intentionally plan for interventions, professional development on the use of resources identified on the BPS Decision Tree will be made available upon request or prior to first implementation if needed to build teacher capacity. Teachers will participate in grade level intervention model to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to identified students using approved resources.

Supplemental Instruction/Interventions (Tier 2): provides explicit, systematic, small group teacher-led instruction matched to student need, targeting gaps in learning to reduce barriers to students' ability to meet Tier 1 expectations;

Intensive, Individualized Instruction/Interventions (Tier 3): provides explicit, systematic individualized instruction based on student need, one-on-one or very small group instruction with more guided practice, immediate corrective feedback, and frequent progress monitoring; and occurs in addition to core instruction and Tier 2 interventions.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWD and substantially deficient students continue to perform lower than their peers. To best meet the academic needs of all students, intervention time has been spread out to allow coaching cycles and support by the literacy coach to implement research based interventions. Support will be provided by additional stakeholders as appropriate to ensure interventions, documentation, and rich interventions for identified students.

Florida's Formula for Success (Rule 6A-6.053(9)(a), F.A.C.)

K-12 reading instruction will align with Florida's Formula for Success

#### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

#### **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.

Master schedule revised to reflect intervention x5 days per week (completed).

Regularly scheduled MTSS/Data chats.

Securing resources needed for intervention.

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

**By When:** Schedule - Complete. By end of Quarter 1, additional resources for intervention secured.

Access to BPS decision tree.

Access to resources identified on the decision tree.

Access to Professional Development around MTSS.

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

**By When:** Immediate.

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 2023 Science Achievement Score (61%) is an increase from the 2022 Science Achievement Score (56%), however, unlike other reporting categories, Lewis Carroll does not outperform the district or state by a noticeable number. the focus will to be improve Science instruction in Grades K-5 to increase Science proficiency on the Grade 5 State Assessment.

**1. Curriculum Implementation:**

- Utilize the adopted curriculum and resources outlined in the district pacing guide (K-6), as well as Penda Science (3-6), as the foundation for lesson planning.
- Align lesson plans with the district's pacing guide to ensure comprehensive coverage of standards throughout the school year.

**2. Teaching Approach: Five E Model**

- Engage: Start lessons by sparking students' interest and curiosity about the topic using real-world scenarios or intriguing questions.
- Explore: Encourage students to explore concepts through hands-on activities, experiments, and group discussions.
- Explain: Provide explanations and content information to solidify understanding gained during exploration.
- Elaborate: Allow students to apply their knowledge to more complex problems or scenarios, fostering deeper comprehension.
- Evaluate: Assess students' understanding through various methods, such as quizzes, projects, or discussions.

**3. Resource and Activity Integration:**

- Refer to the district pacing guide for suggested resources and activities that align with the curriculum standards and objectives, including the PENDA Lesson Calendar.
- Incorporate a variety of resources, including textbooks, online materials, videos, and interactive simulations to enhance learning experiences as outlined in the district plan.

**4. Assessment and Monitoring:**

- Administer required district assessments to gauge students' progress and mastery of standards.

**5. Collaboration and Professional Development:**

- Collaborate with fellow teachers in grades 3 through 6 to share best practices and implementation strategies for Penda Science.
- Attend district-provided professional development sessions related to science education, curriculum implementation, and assessment techniques when available.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Lewis Carroll students will score at or above the district average on all summative district Science Unit Assessments in PM/Unify. The Science Achievement score will increase to 70% in the Spring of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will attend scheduled Professional Development for PENDA Science (3-6) with the district Science Coach. K-2 Teachers will attend inhouse Professional Development to deepen their understand of the 5-E model for instruction in the primary grades. Regular walkthroughs will be conducted to observe the implementation of Stemscores, the 5 E Model for Instruction, and activities outlined in the district pacing guide. Regular walkthroughs and discussions will occur to discuss ways to assist in the implementation of rich science instruction. Data analysis will be used to determine Teacher Assigned Lessons in PENDA weekly as needed. Professional Development opportunities will be modified and provided based on stakeholder feedback. Evidence of district adopted curriculum and activities will be visible in the learning environment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sandra Kerr (kerr.sandra@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Sarah James, teacher leader, will support teachers in the implementation of the district resources by providing grade level professional development as requested as well as follow up PENDA support if need after the district training. Science monies will be used to replenish resources needed to ensure hands-on learning. Professional development around the 5 E Model will also be made available.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Engaging in professional development to learn more about the 5E model in science is beneficial because it offers a structured and effective approach to science education. The 5E model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) promotes active learning, critical thinking, and hands-on experiences. Mastering this model can enhance teaching abilities, making lessons more interactive and impactful for students. It encourages inquiry-based learning, fosters deeper understanding of concepts, and aligns with modern teaching methodologies. Ultimately, improving your understanding of the 5E model can lead to better student engagement, improved learning outcomes, and a more dynamic classroom environment.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Access to district pacing guides and resources.

Access to consumable resources for hands-on science.

Access to professional development opportunities.

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

**By When:** Immediate. Science Professional Development on Early Release PD Day - September 22, 2023.

Ongoing professional development and coaching as needed.

**Person Responsible:** SARAH JAMES (james.sarah@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** As needed.

## #5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Improve overall school culture.

Teacher and parent survey data indicated the need for clearer communication.

In an effort to increase communication with all stakeholders, Lewis Carroll Staff will continue to:

- Send home letters/flyers.
- Communicate through two-way messaging.
- Communicate through email.
- Send home interims and report cards (paper copies).

In an effort to increase communication the following items will be implemented:

- Facebook communications between school and families.
- Timely communication to staff and families to include relevant information.
- Up to date school calendar (Outlook) to include relevant events.
- LTP communicated to appropriate staff in a timely manner.
- Faculty/Admin meetings moved to Tuesdays to improve the turn around time for communication.

Student and parent survey data indicated the need for more engagement both during and after school.

In an effort to increase engagement between students/families and staff, Lewis Carroll will continue to:

- Hold events that are traditional at Lewis Carroll.
- Encourage parents to join the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).

In an effort to increase engagement between students/families and staff, the following will be implemented:

- Increase the number of family fun events.
- Develop a mentor program to meet the needs of students.

Student survey data showed...

A decrease in Student Engagement (92% in 2020) to (82% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Academic Challenge (46% in 2020) to (36% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Relationships (78% in 2020) to (70% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 A decrease in Instructional Methods (54% in 2020) to (45% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.  
 An increase in Culture (14% in 2020) to (17% in January 2023) on the Youth Truth Survey.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student survey data on the 23-24 Youth Truth Survey.  
 Increase Student Engagement from 82% to 90%.  
 Increase Academic Challenge from 36% to 50%.  
 Increase Relationships from 70% to 80%.  
 Increase Instructional Methods from 45% to 55%.  
 Continue to increase Culture from 17% to 30%.

### Monitoring:

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

Mini student surveys will be developed to guide decision making, as well as to monitor overall Student/Family engagement. Youth Truth survey data will be used to determine effects of newly established Parent Involvement & Engagement Committee.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jami Miner (miner.jami@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Establish Parent Involvement & Engagement Committee

**Person Responsible:** Jami Miner (miner.jami@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Quarter 1 2023

Develop & Maintain Mentoring Program

Develop & Analyze Data from mini-surveys.

**Person Responsible:** Manuel Baez (baez.manuel@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Quarter 1 2023