

Brevard Public Schools

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	28
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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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	[not available]

* 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.

Every student. Every day. Every minute matters. (revised 2021-22)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing tomorrow's leaders today. (revised 2021-22)

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
Falusi, Kimberly	Reading Coach	<p>Supports the successful implementation of high quality Tier 1 K-6 ELA instruction by providing high quality professional development, leveraging resources and participating in coaching cycles.</p> <p>Serves as an instructional leader by sharing with teachers, high quality instructional practices and modeling lessons.</p> <p>Monitors the effective implementation of ELA curriculum by conducting data analysis meetings with grade level teachers and determining adjustments to practice as needed.</p>
Dugan, Matthew	Other	<p>Teacher on Assignment</p> <p>Manages the implementation of school wide procedural goals including CHAMPS and PBIS. Ensures teachers are provided with appropriate training and effectively implement practices. Collects data from walkthroughs and feedback from teachers to determine areas of success and support areas of development.</p> <p>Solicits feedback from school stakeholders for continued improvement.</p>
Lucero, Anna Jeanne	Other	<p>interventionist</p> <p>Support struggling students with intervention. Collaborate with Leadership team in the decision making process.</p>
Zhan, Yun (AMY)	Other	<p>interventionist</p> <p>Title I Coordinator Support struggling students Collaborate with Leadership team in the decision making process. Solicits feedback from school stakeholders for continued improvement.</p>
Tagye, Gina	Principal	<p>Develops and shares a vision of academic success including the allocation of fiscal and human capital resources. Monitors effectiveness of vision through classroom walkthroughs, Instructional Rounds with District Leaders and data analysis to ensure all systems align within the school community in order to improve student achievement.</p> <p>Serves as the Instructional Leader of the building. Leverages resource to provide teachers with the tools to support high quality learning and instruction. Models instructional practices through participation in collaborative planning and school wide professional development.</p> <p>Coordinates the development of an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports to ensure students with need are</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

provided with additional supports to achieve success. Leverages school leadership team members, teachers, and any additional staff that may be able to offer support in their area of expertise. It is through these meetings that discussions of classroom assessment data, grade level data trends, teaching strategies, curriculum, progress monitoring, and student behaviors are analyzed. If implemented interventions do not show an increase in student performance, a new or more intensive approach is developed.

Gleason, Rita	Teacher, K-12	interventionist	Support struggling students with intervention. Collaborate with Leadership team in the decision making process.
---------------	---------------	-----------------	---

Shares a vision of academic success . Monitors effectiveness of vision through classroom walkthroughs, Instructional Rounds with District Leaders and data analysis to ensure all systems align within the school community in order to improve student achievement.

Serves as an Instructional Leader of the building. Works with the principal to leverage resources to provide teachers with the tools to support high quality learning and instruction. Models instructional practices through participation in collaborative planning and school wide professional development.

ZICCARDI, Assistant
EVELYN Principal

Coordinates the development of an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports to ensure students with need are provided with additional supports to achieve success. Leverages school leadership team members, teachers, and any additional staff that may be able to offer support in their area of expertise. It is through these meetings that discussions of classroom assessment data, grade level data trends, teaching strategies, curriculum, progress monitoring, and student behaviors are analyzed. If implemented interventions do not show an increase in student performance, a new or more intensive approach is developed.

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

505

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

4

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	51	53	73	68	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	9	5	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	1	2	7	9	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	17	34	34	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA Assessments	0	0	0	7	35	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math Assessment	0	0	0	6	38	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	9	1	8	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	48	63	76	85	68	79	78	0	0	0	497
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	21	17	19	14	18	14	0	0	0	110

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/12/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	1	3	3	1	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	2	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	1	1	1	0	4	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	2	7	2	4	2	26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	6	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%			39%	62%	57%	37%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%			52%	60%	58%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%			56%	57%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	40%			51%	63%	63%	53%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%			60%	65%	62%	71%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%			45%	53%	51%	58%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	41%			70%	57%	53%	47%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	31%	64%	-33%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	26%	61%	-35%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
06	2021					
	2019	33%	60%	-27%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	41%	61%	-20%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	64%	-25%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2021					
	2019	46%	67%	-21%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady K-6

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	25	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	22	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	4
	English Language Learners	3	8	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	14	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	12	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	3
	English Language Learners	0	2	9

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7	10	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	9	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	19	2
	English Language Learners	0	9	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	3	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	2	17
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	3

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	20	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	18	25
	Students With Disabilities	2	4	5
	English Language Learners	1	3	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	13	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	11	19
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	4
	English Language Learners	1	3	5
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	31	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	26	30
	Students With Disabilities	3	6	6
	English Language Learners	0	2	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	13	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	11	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	3	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	3

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	16	22
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	16	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	16	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	ANA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	16	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	13	19
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	1
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	24	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	24	28
	Students With Disabilities	1	3	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	42	47	22	50	58	7				
ELL	24	46	47	42	67	44	25				
BLK	26	51	60	31	61	67	32				
HSP	25	46	47	44	63	44	30				
MUL	50	67		50	53						
WHT	44	55		41	47		67				
FRL	31	49	59	40	62	55	38				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	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				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	42
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	43
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	55
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

Native American Students	
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	51
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

FSA Scores:

ELA 3-5 32% down from 39%
 ELA Learning Gains 51% down from 52%
 ELA L25% LG 53% down from 56%

Math 3-5 40% down from 51%
 Math Learning Gains 59% (down from 60%)
 Math L 25% LG 48% (up from 45%)

Science 3-5 41% (down from 70%)

SWD - Federal Index (across all content areas) of 2021 34% up from 33%. Still an area of concern.

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

ELA Levels 3-5
 Based on iReady Reading Diagnostic 3 scores for 2020-21, 47% of all students were working at or above grade level. (An increase from 23% at the beginning of the school year.) Twenty four percent of our SWD demonstrated proficiency in iReady Reading. However, FSA data shows ELA 3-5 32%

down from 39%
ELA Learning Gains 51% down from 52%
ELA L25% LG 53% down from 56%

Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25%

Math scores showed 43% of all students working on or above grade level, an increase from 14% at the beginning of the year. While this shows good growth, we continue to work toward our goal of 100% of students work on/above grade level in both subjects. 21 percent of our SWD demonstrated proficiency on the end of year iReady Math diagnostic. Cambridge's lowest 25% of students is made up of students in this subgroup and this will continue to be a targeted group for improvement.

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

Need for solid Tier 1 instruction and improved resources for ELA.

Contributing factors to these low performing areas include instruction not being fully standards-aligned and/or standards being taught to the full intent of the standard based upon walkthrough observational data, & a decrease in the fidelity of consistent i-Ready usage by students. Additionally, the achievement gap has increased due to COVID which identifies a need for more instructional cohesiveness, progress monitoring,

With the implementation of new BEST standards and new ELA programs K-6, Tier I instruction will be our focus. We will continue walk to intervention and intervention teachers (T) to identify missing skills and work with students to close those gaps.

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

FSA 2021 ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25% were 53% and ELA Learning Gains were 53%.
Math Learning Gains were 59%.

2021 Science Achievement was 41% which was above the ELA proficiency rate for 5th grade which was 31%.

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

Walk to intervention model was implemented with intervention teachers (T) identifying missing skills and working with students to close those gaps.

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

Scaffolding intentionally
Diagnosing Essential Missed Learning
New ELA Program with rigorous teaching and learning

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

New ELA Program training and ongoing coaching

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

3 additional teachers (2 paid with Title I funds) will be used daily to support Lowest 25% and students identified as struggling to meet grade level expectations.

Teachers will use Read Naturally (T) and 95% Group materials to improve instruction. Literacy Coach (T) will collaboratively plan and support all ELA classroom teachers. ELA and Math Academic Support tutoring beginning Oct 2021 (twice a week after school) to target students in grades 3-6)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Our CNA Team (T) reviewed assessment and survey (student, parent, teacher) data to identify areas of strength and opportunities for growth.

Based on iReady Reading Diagnostic 3 scores for 2020-21, 47% of all students were working at or above grade level. (An increase from 23% at the beginning of the school year.) Twenty four percent of our SWD demonstrated proficiency in iReady Reading.

Math scores showed 43% of all students working on or above grade level, an increase from 14% at the beginning of the year. While this shows good growth, we continue to work toward our goal of 100% of students work on/above grade level in both subjects. 21 percent of our SWD demonstrated proficiency on the end of year iReady Math diagnostic.

FSA Scores:

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 ELA 3-5 32% down from 39%
 ELA Learning Gains 51% down from 52%
 ELA L25% LG 53% down from 56%
 Math 3-5 40% down from 51%
 Math Learning Gains 59% (down from 60%)
 Math L 25% LG 48% (up from 45%)

Science 3-5 41% (down from 70%)

Contributing factors to these low performing areas include instruction not being fully standards-aligned and/or standards being taught to the full intent of the standard based upon walkthrough observational data, & a decrease in the fidelity of consistent i-Ready usage by students. Additionally, the achievement gap has increased due to COVID which identifies a need for more instructional cohesiveness, progress monitoring,

With the implementation of new BEST standards and new ELA programs K-6, Tier I instruction will be our focus. We will continue walk to intervention and intervention teachers (T) to identify missing skills and work with students to close those gaps.

In 2021-22, the third Diagnostic for iReady Reading and Math will show that at least 55% of all students will be working at or above grade level. We will increase ELA SWD subgroup proficiency from 24% to 45%.

FSA scores for 2021-22

Measureable Outcome:
 ELA 3-5 55%
 ELA Learning Gains 55%
 ELA L25% LG 55%

Math 3-5 55%
 Math Learning Gains 65%
 Math L 25% LG 55%

Science 3-5 55%

Monitoring: We will monitor growth using iReady diagnostics, Benchmark/SAVVAS assessments, and standards mastery (grades 2-6 use Standards Mastery) Standards Mastery assessments will be administered approximately twice per quarter to

show class and grade level achievement of standards. Observational data will also be collected by the leadership team to show fidelity of Tier 1 instructional practices.

We will use Write Score data to track students who attend ASP Saturdays.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Falusi (falusi.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Use of the coaching (T) cycle for collaborative planning, modeling, followup, and monitoring through instructional chats and observational data. The district curriculum maps will also serve as a guide to ensure correct pacing of instruction throughout the school year. Collaborative planning (T) will help teachers develop clarity and establish learning targets for their students, both of which have effect sizes greater than .40 which is proven to boost student achievement based upon John Hattie's Visible Learning research. When teachers have a clear understanding of what students are expected to master at their grade level, their instructional practices are more targeted. The continuous feedback (from peers, coaches and administration) from observational data will also guide teachers to refine their practices within the coaching cycles. We plan to have grade level teams observe and provide feedback to their peers, impacting teacher efficacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By giving guidance and job-embedded professional development to teachers in regards to planning and implementing standards-aligned instruction, the students will benefit from a more engaging, rigorous learning environment with opportunities to show mastery of standards. It will also include our ESE teachers who can enhance the lessons and instruction with research-based strategies to improve performance by students with disabilities, as well as, benefiting others. The use of complex text will assist with improving our ELA proficiency and student tasks will be more aligned with the test specifications based upon FSA. For our lower grades, it will build a stronger foundation in ELA to improve student achievement long-term.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA instruction

1. Data meetings
2. Monthly Peer visits and feedback
3. Instructional Coaching

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

Math Instruction

1. We will continue to use Eureka in grades K-5 and follow the district pacing guides.

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

Previous state and local assessment data will be disaggregated to find areas of limited proficiency of our school.

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

Instructional staff will attend professional development training during pre-planning to increase knowledge of the new ELA program and BEST standards.

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

Grade levels will collaboratively review district focus documents and plan bi-weekly to examine standards and new ELA materials to ensure all Tier 1 instruction, tasks and assessments are aligned to the full intent of the standard. Collaborative planning sessions will be facilitated by instructional coaches funded by Title I.

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

Students will take a standards mastery assessments, Benchmark and SAVVAS progress monitoring to ensure the instruction isteaching to the full intent of the standard.

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

Monthly data and instructional chats will analyze standards mastery data and student work samples. Through this discussion, all stakeholders will take ownership of challenges and collaborate on action plan to improve or assist. Students who are not meeting grade level expectations will be referred to our ASP/CARES Act tutoring sessions for additional support.

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

Administration, instructional coaches (funded by Title I) and classroom teachers will conduct monthly walkthroughs to collect data on the fidelity of standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, student work, and assessments.

Use of Title I funds to purchase listening center stations in K-2 classrooms to support Read Naturally (T).

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

Feedback will be shared with teachers in the coaching cycle and areas of weakness will be supported with human or material resources such as modeling and teacher training.

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

Evidence of process and progress will be uploaded into our Title 1 Tools for tracking and analysis.

Person Responsible Yun (AMY) Zhan (zhan.yun0@brevardschools.org)

Our fifth graders will attend Zoo School virtually with the Brevard Zoo (T) as a strategy to bring real world connection to the standards. Our fourth graders will attend Lagoon Quest field trip (T) also to bring real world connection.(if allowed during COVID)

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

We will host Family Engagement activities (T) to support ELA, Math, and Science academics and to support families.

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

We will use ASP funds to target students who are substantially deficient/deficient in ELA and Math to provide intervention to in grades 3-6 for ELA, Math, and Writing. (in school, after school and in Saturday sessions).

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2021-2022 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and student Youth Truth survey ". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

Area of Focus Description and

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school (96% yes), communication with classroom teachers (91% at least monthly) and teacher communication with families about their child's progress (93% at least monthly) Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent access of grades and attendance through FOCUS, and more resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information.

Rationale:

Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for BPS in the following categories: Culture and Belonging. These focus areas will be addressed with the Restorative Circles and developing positive relationships with students. Monthly faculty and SAC meetings will include updates on the numbers of positive referrals.

Our faculty insight survey also included areas of strength that included "Observation/ Feedback", "Diversity, Equity and Inclusion" and "Peer Culture". Target areas for improvement include "Learning Environment" and "Academic Opportunity". Using this trend data, we will focus on Tier 1 instruction, BEST standards and new ELA program.

Measureable Outcome:

We will increase the Belonging indicator on the 2022 Youth Truth Survey to 2.55 and the Culture indicator to 2.35. We will also decrease the number of discipline referrals schoolwide as documented in the Rtl Database.
We will decrease the number of discipline referrals by 10%.

Monitoring:

We will monitor discipline referral rate using the RTiB site. The rate is shared with our faculty and SAC monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Dugan (dugan.matthewj@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based

We will use positive relationships, developed during Circle Time and throughout the day, to decrease discipline referrals and increase positive referrals.

Strategy:

We will provide continued training on Conscious Discipline during Bonus Preplanning and throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In 2020-21, we implemented Restorative Circles into our schedule, provided introductory PD to teachers, purchased Circle Forward Books to assist teachers in implementing circles. We saw great improvements in the number of positive referrals and decrease in discipline referrals in 2020-21. We will continue that practice, providing scheduled time, and increase the number of Circle Forward books available for teachers to reference.(Student Teacher relationships have a 0.52 effect size)

Action Steps to Implement

Provide scheduled time for each class to have Restorative Circles. Provide additional Circle Forward Books to support teachers as they implement Circles.
Model Circles in preplanning staff meetings and faculty meetings during the school year.

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

Review schoolwide expectations for students (PBIS) with staff and ensure alignment between current PBIS expectations and the language of Restorative Circles and Conscious Discipline.

Person Responsible Matthew Dugan (dugan.matthewj@brevardschools.org)

Administrators, Coach (T), Interventionists (T) Peers, Teacher on Assignment will conduct walkthroughs to collect data on the implementation and effectiveness of PBIS and Restorative Circles. This observational data will be shared monthly and any issues will be addressed and problem solved.

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

The establishment of a PBIS store and students will be able to spend their Cougar Cash (token economy) at the store each month. Teachers will also integrate a class Cougar Cash incentive program to purchase other items or experiences.

Person Responsible Matthew Dugan (dugan.matthewj@brevardschools.org)

Conscious Discipline Training

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In September 2021, Cambridge was identified as a Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) school based on 20-21 ELA FSA Data. ELA FSA data revealed proficiency by grade level as follows:
 3rd grade - 22%, 4th grade - 37%, and 5th grade - 31%.
 The overall proficiency level for all 3rd - 6th was 32%.
 Additionally, Cambridge's subgroup -students with disabilities (SWD)-demonstrated proficiency below all students on iReady progress monitoring data throughout 20-21 and will be an area of focus in order to raise achievement for all.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency : 32% increase to 55%
 3RD GRADE ELA proficiency: 22% increase to 50%
 4TH GRADE ELA proficiency: 37% increase to 55%
 5TH GRADE ELA proficiency 31% increase to 55%

Monitoring: We will monitor growth using iReady diagnostics and standards mastery (grades 2-6 use Standards Mastery)
 Standards Mastery assessments will be administered approximately twice per quarter to show class and grade level achievement of standards.

Observational data will also be collected by the leadership team to show fidelity of Tier 1 instructional practices and to best practices in intervention instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gina Tagye (tagye.gina@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: *Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption list.
 Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) ©2022, Florida Edition
 myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6, ©2022, 1st Edition
 *iReady - Students at Cambridge arrive at varying ability levels. Driven by the i-Ready Diagnostic, tools for Instruction provide actionable, in-the-moment resources for addressing skills gaps in small group and one-on-one settings.
 *Lexia Strong level of evidence, as defined by ESSA (Hurwitz & Vanacore, 2020)
 *95% Group Materials
 *Read Naturally

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: *Benchmark/SAVVAS : Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. Collaborative planning for instruction will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction.
 **Lexia: Lexia aims to build foundational reading skills for students through personalized learning. The program focuses on six aspects of reading instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and structural analysis.
 **95% Group - Students have skill gaps in foundational reading skills and are in Tier 2/3 intervention. These materials are uniquely designed to provide targeted instruction on specific skills. Struggling readers are able to master simple concepts before moving onto more difficult skills.

****Read Naturally:** Chosen to support ESE/ELL students that are substantially deficient. Features include well-designed instruction, research-based interventions and high-quality instructional supports to empower self-directed learning.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA instruction

1. Data meetings
2. Monthly Peer visits and feedback
3. Instructional Coaching

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

As a "RAISE" school in need of intensive support, our Literacy Leadership Team will work with a Regional State Literacy coach to improve literacy instruction and instructional coaching on our campus. Our Literacy coach will meet weekly as part of the Coach Academy. Literacy Leadership will participate in scheduled virtual check ins, Literacy Walks, and collaborative planning and implementation.

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

Grade levels will collaboratively review district focus documents and plan bi-weekly to examine standards and new ELA materials to ensure all Tier 1 instruction, tasks and assessments are aligned to the full intent of the standard. Collaborative planning sessions will be facilitated by instructional coaches funded by Title I.

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

Instructional staff will attend professional development training during pre-planning to increase knowledge of the new ELA program and BEST standards.

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

Administration, instructional coaches (funded by Title I) and classroom teachers will conduct monthly walkthroughs to collect data on the fidelity of standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, student work, and assessments.

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

Monthly data and instructional chats will analyze standards mastery data and student work samples. Through this discussion, all stakeholders will take ownership of challenges and collaborate on action plan to improve or assist. Students who are not meeting grade level expectations will be referred to our ASP/CARES Act tutoring sessions for additional support.

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

Feedback will be shared with teachers in the coaching cycle and areas of weakness will be supported with human or material resources such as modeling and teacher training.

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

Students will take a standards mastery assessment at least twice quarterly to ensure the instruction is teaching to the full intent of the standard.

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

We will use ASP funds to target students who are substantially deficient/deficient in ELA and Math to provide intervention to in grades 3-6 for ELA, Math, and Writing. (in school, after school and in Saturday sessions).

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See area of focus above

Cambridge has been identified as Moderate for reported incidents when compared to all elementary school statewide (0.6 incidents per 100 students)

We use Positive Referrals as a way to recognize students doing great things on our campus. We are tracking the positive referral rate as well as discipline referral rate per month.

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.

Cambridge continues to work on building a positive school culture and environment through Positive Behavior Support implementation and building classroom communities through creating positive student-student & student-adult relationships.

Additionally, the Cambridge leadership team examines parent, teacher and student survey data annually to improve the learning environment and culture.

The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school (96% yes), communication with classroom teachers (91% at least monthly) and teacher communication with families about their child's progress (93% at least monthly) Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent access of grades and attendance through FOCUS, and more resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information.

Teacher Survey Results:

In January 2021, teachers completed a survey and identified Academic Opportunity (in particular "students at my school can achieve the academic standards at their grade level.") and Learning Environment (consistent expectations/consequences for behavior) as areas for improvement. In response, a team of teachers worked to create common expectations for behavior and posters to make them visible in each classroom. A PBIS store has been established and activities will be refreshed to bring new interest for students.

In January 2021, our students in grades 3-6 completed an anonymous online survey called Youth Truth. We received feedback from 293 (90%) of our students. This is their voice, their perception.

Students rated engagement and academic challenge as the highest ratings and feel that we can improve on culture and sense of belonging.

In response to student feedback, Cambridge is using restorative practice circles to allow classroom community members to have a voice, to be heard. Monthly faculty and SAC meetings will include updates on the numbers of positive referrals.

Additionally, Cambridge is implementing PBIS activities, and positive referral shouts out from staff to students.

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

All serve to promote our school's message, contribute to our positive school culture and environment.

Engaging ALL Stakeholders:

Cambridge engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.

Teachers and Staff

Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Teachers meet in collaborative planning weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff.

New Teachers - The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

Front Office Staff - As the front line to customer service and family support, Cambridge's front office works to be a positive, friendly "first impression" for all who come in to the office.

STUDENTS

Student work is displayed throughout school. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches.

FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY:

SAC - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders).