

Brevard Public Schools

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School

2000 CAMBRIDGE DR, Cocoa, FL 32922

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

Demographics

Principal: Regina Tagye M

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

A model community of excellence and success

Provide the school's vision statement

To inspire and empower lifelong learners

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
Tagye, Gina	Principal	Instructional Leader Monitor schoolwide data and in particular 6th grade iReady data, meet with students to encourage them to pass lessons, chart progress Classroom Walkthroughs conducted with Leadership Team using the SIP Walkthrough tool Meet with SAC, other stakeholder groups Parent/Family Engagement activities
Speir, Chana	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Monitor schoolwide data and in particular 1st grade iReady data, meet with students to encourage them to pass lessons, chart progress Classroom Walkthroughs with Leadership Team Meet with SAC, other stakeholder groups Parent/Family Engagement activities
Clevenger, Jonell	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Member Literacy Coach Monitor Data for 3rd grade Coach ELA teachers with Tier 1 instruction, discuss progress monitoring data with administrators and teachers Walk to Intervention group Classroom Walkthrough
Kirkpatrick, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Member Title I coordinator Monitor Data for 4th grade Classroom Walkthrough Interventionist
Falusi, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Leadership Team Member Math Coach for Primary teachers- Tier 1 instruction with fidelity Monitor data Classroom Walkthrough
Lucero, Anna Jeanne	Teacher, K-12	Title I Reading and Math intervention Monitor math data for 3-6th grades Classroom Walkthroughs Reading Intervention group

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 1/6/2019, Regina Tagye M

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.*

5

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

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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	48	63	76	85	68	79	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	17	19	14	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	1	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	0	4	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	7	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	85	91	78	93	96	86	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	52	53	39	39	43	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	7	6	13	9	8	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	7	6	11	4	40	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	3	10	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	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	85	91	78	93	96	86	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	52	53	39	39	43	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	7	6	13	9	8	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	7	6	11	4	40	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	3	10	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	39%	62%	57%	37%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	60%	58%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	57%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	51%	63%	63%	53%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	60%	65%	62%	71%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	53%	51%	58%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	70%	57%	53%	47%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	64%	-33%	58%	-27%
	2018	31%	63%	-32%	57%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	61%	-35%	58%	-32%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	60%	-27%	54%	-21%
	2018	42%	63%	-21%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	61%	-20%	62%	-21%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	64%	-25%	64%	-25%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				
06	2019	46%	67%	-21%	55%	-9%
	2018	73%	68%	5%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	56%	13%	53%	16%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	43	45	26	44	37	7				
ELL	31	52	64	45	61	61	70				
BLK	30	52	55	41	56	36	62				
HSP	35	49	58	47	58	58	64				
MUL	52	53		55	57						
WHT	53	57		68	69		91				

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
FRL	36	50	54	51	60	46	66				

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	13	24	20	25	59	40	19				
ELL	17	35	33	40	68	71	8				
BLK	20	35	32	34	63	54	31				
HSP	36	48	37	56	77	64	36				
MUL	52	61		61	76						
WHT	58	55		71	76		74				
FRL	36	46	34	51	71	57	44				

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
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	56
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students

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

ELA Achievement Levels 3+ In Sept 2020 21% of students scored at Tier 1, 43% scored at Tier 2 and 36% scored at Tier 3 instructional levels on the iReady Reading Diagnostic. In March 2020 school was closed due to COVID 19. The remote instruction was not as effective as a full day of in-person instruction. This coupled with the summer slide has left students with unfinished learning and a larger gap than a normal summer may provide.

In 2019-20 we worked extensively on standards aligned instruction. We will continue that. We believe that focusing on grade level tasks is the next step.

Our ESSA subgroup that falls below 41% is SWD. We will continue to focus on that group of students and monitor their growth throughout the year.

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

Math Lowest 25% making annual learning gain 2019 FSA Math Data: 51% of students scored levels 3-5 and 60% of students made an annual learning gain.

On Fall 2020 iReady Math Diagnostic, 20 % of students in grades 1-6 were placed in Tier 1, 31% in Tier 2 and 49% in Tier 3.

In March 2020 school was closed due to COVID 19. The remote instruction was not as effective as a full day of in-person instruction. This coupled with the summer slide has left students with unfinished learning and a larger gap than a normal summer may provide.

We began implementing Eureka in grades K-5 during the 2019-20 school year and will continue in 20-21. We believe this standards aligned math instruction, along with the support of a math coach will help to increase student achievement.

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

ELA Achievement Levels 3+

Trends remain flat 2017 = 44%, 2018 = 37%. 2019 = 39%

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

Science Achievement Levels 3+

Strong standards aligned lesson planning and tasks, met with students to conference,

Science Blast after school sessions.

We continue to use Title I funds to hire a Science teacher to be on the Activity schedule to provide additional instruction weekly to all grades K-6 (T). We continue to partner with Brevard Zoo to provide unique Science opportunities to our Fifth Grade students. (T)

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

SWD and African American Students

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

1. Addressed unfinished learning, due to pandemic, through scaffolding and grade level tasks.
2. Support teachers with academic coaches
3. Intervention at each grade level
4. Restorative Practice Circles and Conscious Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

On 2019 ELA FSA 52% of students made an annual learning gain and 39% scored at levels 3-5.
 In Sept 2020 21% of students scored at Tier 1, 43% scored at Tier 2 and 36% scored at Tier 3 instructional levels on the iReady Reading Diagnostic.

Our HeadStart PreK program readiness rate is below the minimum rate of 60. When we have an effective, successful program it will positively impact our Early Literacy in the primary grades.

ELearning is proving to be a challenge as not all students are working the full day, completing assignments, etc. This impacts student learning and attention to assessments/assignments.

Measureable Outcome:

Students' 20-21 iReady reading diagnostic 3 results will show that 55% or more met or exceeded their typical growth goal.
 The number of students making an annual learning gain on the 2021 FSA will increase from 52% to 55%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chana Speir (speir.chana@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Tier 1 Core instruction is the key to improving student achievement: grade level instruction, texts and tasks in every class every day. ELA team planning will continue based on the work we began in 2019-20 to ensure Tier 1 instruction is well planned for.(Collective teacher efficacy) Classroom walk throughs and coaching will provide opportunities for improved teaching practices.

In addition, providing the right, targeted intervention to students at the right time is important. We will continue to provide intervention using research based instructional materials. (T) (iReady, LLI, Cracking the Code, Vocabulary Surge, Rewards, 95% Group PASI/PSI, Lexia) Reading interventionists and instructional assistants will work with teachers and our Literacy Coach to provide intervention, progress monitor, meet to discuss data adjust student placement as progress is made. (T)

For 20-21 students in grades 3-6 will take Write Score (T) assessments 3 times and students in grade 2 will take it twice. The results will be used to adjust Writing instruction.

Our assistant principal & district assigned instructional coach will work with our Head Start teachers to ensure Gold Standards lessons and activities are implemented.

One School, One Book will be implemented school wide using the book Rump.(T) Building excitement for reading is the goal.

Rationale for Evidence-

Targeted intervention is a high yield strategy with an effective size of 1.07 according to John Hattie.
 Scaffolding has an effective size of 0.82

based The effect size for Collective Teacher is 1.57
Strategy: The effect size of Coaching is 0.52.

Action Steps to Implement

Title I Coaches (Literacy and Math) will meet with grade level teachers to plan for Tier 1 instruction. (T)

Coaches and administrators will conduct classroom walk throughs to monitor and provide feedback on Tier 1 instruction.(T)

The school Leadership team worked together to develop an intervention schedule, identify research based intervention materials (see above), progress monitoring tools, and schedule grade level intervention time. Use Title I money to purchase intervention materials and hire intervention teachers and instructional assistants to support students during intervention. (T)

Provide Professional Development/training for teachers on intervention tools and progress monitoring tools. (T) Coaching is ongoing PD (T)

Monitor intervention instruction and progress monitoring results.

Look into Executive Functioning PD to help teachers working with ESE students in Gen Ed classes.

Person Responsible Gina Tagye (tagye.gina@brevardschools.org)

We will use the CARES Academic Support funds to provide additional help to students in the area of ELA.

Super Saturday plans are underway to provide fun learning opportunities in a relaxed and more casual atmosphere. Learning activities will be provided in grade level bands and incorporate the book Rump, our One School One Book selection for the 2020-21 year (T). Students will be invited to participate based on assessment data.

We will use ASP and Title I funds to hire an additional instructional assistant to support students (T).

Person Responsible Chana Speir (speir.chana@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When students' social emotional needs are addressed, learning can take place. The impact of COVID 19 and social unrest on students emotional state has been great. We believe that combination of Conscious Discipline Training for all teachers and the implementation of Restorative Circles in the daily schedule and Culturally responsive strategies will impact our students' relationships and behaviors positively.
Measureable Outcome:	When students's social emotional needs are addressed, learning can take place. The impact of COVID 19 and social unrest on students emotional state has been great. We believe that combination of Conscious Discipline Training for all teachers and the implementation of Restorative Circles in the daily schedule and Culturally responsive strategies will impact our students' relationships and behaviors positively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Dugan (dugan.matthewj@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline Restorative Practice Circles (T)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strong, positive relationships between students and between students and teachers create a positive classroom and school culture. When students feel safe, learn to self regulate, and verbalize their feelings and needs, they are better able to attend and learn. Teacher-Student relationships have an effect size of 0.52 according to John Hattie's research and meta analysis in Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Purchase Better than Carrots and Sticks books for teachers. (T) to go with Professional Development provided in August 2020.
 Provide Conscious Discipline and Restorative Practice Circles training to faculty during pre-planning and follow up as needed. (T)
 Build time into classroom schedules for Restorative Practice Circles. This goes along with Culturally Responsive Teaching: Listening, respecting differences, using language that builds trust positive relationships.
 Purchase additional copies of Circle Forward for teachers to support in guiding circles. (T)
 Provide additional PD ion Restorative Circles in October 2020
 Our school is celebrating monthly, different heritages (for example, Sept 15-Oct 15 is Hispanic Heritage Month-art and music teachers are incorporating activities, Circle discussions include topics about different cultures)

Person Responsible Gina Tagye (tagye.gina@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Eureka Math engages students in understanding math concepts not just using an algorithm. We have used Title I money to hire a Math coach and interventionist to support teachers and students. When teachers see themselves as part of a team working for their students, a positive impact is made on student achievement. Teachers will work with Title I Math teachers/ instructional coaches to plan for Eureka Math lessons, ways to scaffold student learning, tasks, and assessments, review the data and make adjustments to instruction as needed thus building collective efficacy. (T)</p> <p>2019 FSA Math Data: 51% of students scored levels 3-5 and 60% of students made an annual learning gain. On Fall 2020 iReady Math Diagnostic, 20 % of students in grades 1-6 were placed in Tier 1, 31% in Tier 2 and 49% in Tier 3.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Students making an annual learning gain will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by the 2020 Math FSA. Students scoring at proficiency (Levels 3-5) on the 2021 Math FSA will increase from 51% to 60%. Students 20-21 iReady Math diagnostic 3 results will show at least 60% of students meeting or exceeding their typical growth.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Chana Speir (speir.chana@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We will use the following strategies which have been identified in John Hattie's Visible Learning as having high effect size. Collective Efficacy = 1.57 effect size, Scaffolding = 0.82 effect size and Coaching = 0.52 effect size.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We want teachers to understand the Eureka methodologies so they continue to build capacity and efficacy. Our Math coach and interventionist will support teachers as they plan effective Tier 1 lessons including scaffolding to support those students with unfinished learning due to COVID and summer slide.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to implement Eureka Math in grades K-5, have regularly scheduled meeting with math instructional coach, using the (T) coaching model to build a continuous model of improvement, use CARES ACT fund to pay for teachers to lead a Super Saturday day of fun instructional activities with Math as the focus. Title I interventionists will provide intervention.(T)

Monitor instruction and assessment data.

We plan to have students star in "advertisements" to teach parents/families Eureka Math strategies such as number bonds, ten frames, arrays, tape diagrams, and the Read, Draw, Write method (T)

Provide family support through virtual family nights that demonstrate the math strategies used in classes so families are better able to support their children.(T)

Throughout the year, data will be monitored, lessons adjusted.

After end of year results are in, the Leadership Team will meet to analyze and conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (T).

Person Responsible Kimberly Falusi (falusi.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science FSA scores in 2019 were much improved (increase from 47% to 70% of students scoring at levels 3-5. We want to continue that progress by supporting students with the Virtual Science Fair and Super Saturday Science activities along with fifth grade's Science Blast. One of our Title I nights will be to support families with the virtual science fair.

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.

In alignment with Objective 3 of Strategic Plan (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development) we are developing the following strategies to be implemented at Cambridge this year to support SEL needs of all students stemming from COVID absences.

During the summer of 2020, we invited parents and teachers to participate in focus groups to analyze survey and academic data. The Youth Truth, Parent, and Insight (Teacher) surveys as well as discipline referral rates show a need for a new approach to discipline. The discussions included the introduction of Restorative Practices and Circles. The idea that positive relationships and teaching students how to deal with conflict is an approach we plan to implement. Preplanning training for teachers and follow up throughout the year, along with resources purchased with Title I funds, building the class schedules to include Restorative Circle time, parent information are strategies we will use to increase a positive culture and environment at Cambridge.

Also during preplanning, teachers were trained in Conscious Discipline. Those strategies will

support teachers as they teach students self regulation and taking responsibility.

We will continue to seek input from stakeholders to gauge improvement.

Title I funds will be used to support social emotional component.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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