

Calhoun County School District

Carr Elementary & Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Carr Elementary & Middle School

18987 NW SR 73, Clarksville, FL 32430

www.carrschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Karen Pitts

Start Date for this Principal: 10/14/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Calhoun 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Carr School is provide a safe, caring, stimulating, and student centered environment so each student may become a productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Carr School is to create a place where rich heritage and expanding opportunities for the future enable our students to prepare for life. We strive to create a place that believes:

- * learning never stops.
- * high expectations and challenging curriculum lead to greater achievements.
- * community/parental involvement is essential for successful schools.
- * outstanding, highly qualified and dedicated personnel are critical to success.
- * students' need drive decisions.
- * students should be taught that everyone is responsible for his or her own actions.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pitts, Karen	Principal	
Shelton, Stephanie	Guidance Counselor	
O'Bryan, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	
Hammitt, Georgia	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 10/14/2020, Karen Pitts

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

2

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	24	26	19	25	19	24	26	28	20	0	0	0	0	211
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	3	2	3	3	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

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		2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	62%	61%	63%	61%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	61%	59%	61%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	54%	45%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	64%	62%	65%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	59%	47%	50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	52%	31%	40%	52%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	56%	52%	56%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	71%	75%	78%	77%	74%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
	2018	68%	62%	6%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
	2018	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	56%	-9%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	52%	53%	-1%	52%	0%
	2018	76%	63%	13%	51%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	75%	70%	5%	56%	19%
	2018	70%	70%	0%	58%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	67%	-12%	62%	-7%
	2018	92%	77%	15%	62%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-37%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	70%	9%	64%	15%
	2018	43%	65%	-22%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	50%	56%	-6%	60%	-10%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	70%	64%	6%	55%	15%
	2018	46%	63%	-17%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
07	2019	64%	68%	-4%	54%	10%
	2018	77%	71%	6%	54%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	75%	54%	21%	46%	29%
	2018	87%	68%	19%	45%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	54%	56%	-2%	48%	6%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	74%	-2%	71%	1%
2018	74%	77%	-3%	71%	3%
Compare		-2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	66%	34%	61%	39%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		100%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	38	40	33	46	35	14				
WHT	62	59	48	70	71	48	50	71	61		
FRL	56	60	54	63	64	44	45	65	69		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	23	48	41	27	24	15	8				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	64	59	36	65	46	31	55	79	50		
FRL	61	64	48	57	43	29	44	75			

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	60
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance was the Lowest 25th percentile in math. However, it did increase from 31% in 2018 to 48% in 2019.

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

The Social Studies Component had the greatest decline. Social Studies went from 77% in 2018 to 71% in 2019. There were instructional inconsistencies due to unforeseen circumstances. Hurricane Michael attributed to the decline in this particular cell.

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

The Social Studies Component and the Science Component had the greatest decline. Both of these components were 7% below the state average. There were instructional inconsistencies due to unforeseen circumstances. Hurricane Michael attributed also contributed to the decline in this particular cell.

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

The data component with the greatest gain was the Math Learning Gains Component. The Math Learning Gains Component went from 47% in 2018 to 69% in 2019. The implementation of small group instruction in the classroom as well as providing tutoring before and after school contributed to this gain.

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

School wide attendance is an area of concern. If students are not here to receive instruction they will not experience growth. Many of our most struggling students are often absent or tardy. We need to continue to work with families to ensure children are here and on time as well as adjust and monitor our attendance plan.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Science
4. Third Grade ELA Scores 2021
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance is 48% in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile Component, as evidenced by the 2019 FSA Scores. As a result we were 4% below the state average. During the 2020-2021 school year the Math Lowest 25th Percentile Component will increase by 10% from 48% to 58%.

Measureable Outcome: The percent of all students in the Lowest 25th percentile will increase by 10% on the Spring 2021 FSA Math Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Pitts (karen.pitts@calhounflschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Collaboratively plan with classroom teachers for grade level, student centered complex tasks, deliberately planned with a trajectory of rigor and challenge, utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction
- Progress Monitor using iReady and STAR Math to ensure the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies are being implemented to meet the needs of students.
- Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery, focusing on a clustering process to meet student needs.
- Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaboration among teachers and administration discussing progress monitoring data increases accountability among both groups. After reviewing progress monitoring data both parties can give input on how to shift instruction to best meet the needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As our school prepares for both online and brick and mortar learning, we will focus more than ever on strengthening relations with students and families.

We will do that by the following:

Collaboration - Families and community organization are vital to student success. Authentic teamwork by both parties is critical. Teachers will share data and resources to support student learning in and out of the classroom via ParentSquare, notes homes, phone calls, emails, school website, and Google Classroom.

Cooperation - Schools and families working together to provide the best education possible for students.

Communication - Sharing information and being transparent is critical. We plan to create a meaningful system for all voices to be heard and incorporate their feedback into the decision-making process by providing them with regular opportunities to share feedback and concerns via surveys, virtual parent conferences, and ParentSquare .

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Parental involvement is the key to student success. The faculty and staff at CARR School are committed to family and community engagement. CARR strives each year to collaborate with parents and community members in an effort to educate, empower, and support families to enable them to effectively reinforce learning at home with their child. Although this year will be quite different in terms of family engagement at the school level we will continue to encourage our students and families to set goals in order to receive AR incentives, iReady incentives, SPIRE incentives, and Attendance and Honor Roll recognition. Parents were given Parental Involvement calendars at the beginning of the school year with details of important dates and information included. Parents were also provided with steps as to how to check grades using the FOCUS parent portal, how to sign up for Accelerated Reader emails, and how to access information on the CARR School website. Parent Square log in information was also given out to keep parents actively engaged in their child's education.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00