

Brevard Public Schools

Cape View Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cape View Elementary School

8440 ROSALIND AVE, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Long A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2013

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cape View Elementary School

8440 ROSALIND AVE, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Cape View teachers and staff will focus on collaborative planning, standards based instruction and eLearning implementation with fidelity to meet the academic needs of brick and mortar students as well as eLearning students.

Revised 2020

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Cape View community works to cultivate a positive learning environment at school and via eLearning by meeting the social-emotional needs of students first and then meeting academic needs for success.

Revised 2020

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
Keane, Jill	Principal	As principal, my primary responsibility is for the safety and well being of all students and staff. As a school leader, I monitor the instructional program to ensure all students have equitable learning opportunities. I communicate all data and information to all stakeholders and utilize their feedback for school improvement. I work closely with my instructional coaches to support standards-aligned planning and coaching as needed. Additionally, I monitor student engagement and standards-aligned instructional practices to provide teachers with feedback for improved instruction.
Dodd, Pamela	Instructional Coach	As Literacy Coach, I serve as a stable resource for professional development, progress monitoring and student data analysis throughout the school to generate improvement in ELA. I work within all aspects of the coaching cycle to hone teachers' academic skills so that they may continue to improve their instructional practices.
Brooks, Suzanne	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, I support the teachers and the principal in providing an effective, positive learning environment. In this position, I monitor the fidelity of curriculum, instruction and assessment. I also provide teachers with valuable feedback regarding standards-aligned instructional practice.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/13/2013, Melissa Long A

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	36	37	34	36	40	35	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	278
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	3	2	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	41	39	41	48	39	59	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	324
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	15	12	9	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	8	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	41	39	41	48	39	59	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	324
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	15	12	9	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	8	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	63%	62%	57%	64%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	68%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	57%	53%	56%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	63%	63%	70%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	65%	62%	70%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	53%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	70%	56%	51%

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	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	70%	60%	10%	56%	14%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2019	63%	60%	3%	54%	9%
	2018	69%	63%	6%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
	2018	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
	2018	69%	68%	1%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	56%	2%	53%	5%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	71	82	54	62	54					
ELL	40			50							
HSP	57	59		80	87						
MUL	42			58							
WHT	68	62	80	74	78	67	66				
FRL	60	60	74	69	73	69	58				
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	41	54	47	30	50	47	47				
HSP	70	85		48	23						
MUL	77			62							
WHT	66	58	56	57	56	44	68				

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
FRL	66	60	55	52	44	19	58				
2017 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	19	45	50	42	56	41					
HSP	47	73		63	73						
MUL	71	50		78	83						
WHT	66	68	52	70	67	52	69				
FRL	58	62	46	69	72	68	67				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
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	66
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.

In 2018- 2019 - English Language Arts for fourth grade reflected 52% of the students scoring at level 3 or higher, which is a 4 percent decrease from the previous year and a 16 percent decrease when compared to Cohort data. The contributing factors were identified in the instructional planning and delivery. As a result of the last year's action steps for planning and delivery, our 4th grade 2020 final ELA iReady diagnostic data reflected 64% of the 4th grade students mastering ELA standards. In order to build teacher capacity, it is imperative that all teachers use the Enhanced Standards Focus Document with fidelity.

Two years of data reflect that SWD were the lowest performing subgroup. Data analysis reveals that students continue to struggle with text-based writing.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Current iReady Reading Diagnostic 1 data reveal an increase in students working below grade level across all grade levels excluding 4th grade reading.

Due to transferring to distance learning in March 2020, Kindergarten, first, second, third, fifth and sixth grade students reflected a decline in students' ELA achievement. This clearly shows the impact created during distance learning to the start of the 2020-2021 school year.

As evidenced by comparing last school year's final iReady reading diagnostic to the current school year's initial iReady Reading diagnostic, first grade has a 10% increase in students not mastering grade level standards . Second grade's data reflect a 19% increase in students not mastering grade level standards; 3rd grade has a 20% increase; 4th grade has a 2% decrease; 5th grade has a 15% increase; and 6th grade has a 12% increase in students not mastering grade level standards. Kindergarten doesn't have current school year iReady data as kindergarten students will not begin testing until October 2020.

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 data component which reflects the greatest gap between our school and the state average is in ELA fourth grade in 2019 (52%) as compared to the state average of 58% which is a 6 percent decline. This was because of the fidelity in implementing the Standards Focus Document to support standards-aligned instruction.

When compared to the 2019 (53%) and 2018 (55%) science state averages, Cape View consistently outperformed the state in 2018 (65%) and 2019 (59%). Yet, Cape View has witnessed a downward trend in its science data over the past three years: 2019, 59%; 2018, 65%; and 2017, 70%. A contributing factor to this decline was due to the movement of instructional personnel each school year for the past three years; and for the 2019-2020 school year, school leadership found that there wasn't a strong instructional match for the 5th grade science position.

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

Three subgroup data components that showed the most improvement are ELA, Math and SWD. For 2019, 77% of the lowest 25th percentile students scored at or above grade level in ELA as compared to 2018 when only 58% of the lowest 25th percentile students scores at or above grade level in ELA. Cape View's lowest 25th percentile ELA scores are above that of the district (57%) and the state (53%). As for math, Cape View's lowest 25th percentile students scored 71% on or above grade level in 2019 as compared to 41% in 2018; again, Cape View outperformed that of the district (53%) and state (51%). Cape View's SWD subgroup data reflected 82% of our lowest 25th percentile students scored at or above level grade level in 2019 as compared to 47% in 2018. Our overall federal index ESSA data reflect 69% out of 100%.

1. ELA & SWD - we continue to tweak our school wide writing plan to include writing mentors and writing conferences.
2. Math - teachers followed the scope and sequence of iReady math, to include the iReady Math Teacher Toolbox for identified iReady math groupings and suggested intervention.

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

EWS tracks students who are academically at risk due to attendance, suspensions, prior retention and lack of student achievement. Due to the district's transfer to distance learning for the 2019-2020 school year, attendance was not tracked as in past school years. A learning loss occurred during the 4th 9-weeks due to COVID-19. Student engagement, teacher / student relationships, and the delivery of high-quality instruction were impacted by this state mandate.

Cape View's EWS data indicate that K, 1 and 2 attendance declines as the school year progresses. Currently, administration, guidance and the school SRO work to monitor attendance in brick and mortar and eLearning students. Phone calls and dojo messages are used to communicate attendance patterns with parents.

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

1. Due to Cape View's students transferring to distance learning in March 2020 and the lack of face-to-face instructional delivery, it is evident that student achievement gaps remain in ELA. Teachers will continue to use the district's Standards Focus Documents to guide standards-based instruction in ELA with an emphasis on writing.
2. Based on Cape View's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) subgroup data, White to Hispanic, the three-year data trend indicates that when comparing White students to Hispanic students in 2019, White students outperformed Hispanic students by 21%; in 2018, Hispanic students outperformed White students by a margin of 3%; and in 2017; White students outperformed Hispanic students by 14%. As this data are reflected upon, it is necessary to revisit the instructional processes that were evident in the 2017-2018 school year to determine the successes of Hispanic students.
3. Based on Cape View's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) subgroup data, SWD to non-SWD, the three-year data trend shows in 2019 that 37% of Non-SWD outperformed students with SWD; in 2018, 29% of Non-SWD outperformed SWD; and in 2017 50% of Non-SWD outperformed SWD. Cape View's CARES Act funds will be used to hire additional personnel (IA) to support our students with disabilities. This additional support will be used to close the ELA achievement gap for identified students with disabilities.
4. Cape View's goal was to improve its percentage of 5th grade students scoring 60% or higher on the 5th grade Science Standards Assessment Review Part 1 Assessment from 41% to 50% on the 5th grade Science Standards Assessment Review Part 2 Assessment.

5. Currently, 42% of Cape View's parents use FOCUS as a source for parent-teacher communication, and 85% of parents use Dojo as a source for parent-teacher communication; it is of utmost importance that Cape View increase its use of FOCUS and Dojo to improve parent-teacher communication for the 2020-2021 school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to a decline from 67% to 63% of students performing at or above grade level in ELA (FSA 2019), Cape View teachers will use the Enhanced Standards Focus Document with fidelity when planning. This ensures that all standards are taught. It was observed during walk throughs that lessons required a more intense focus on vocabulary, comprehension and writing.

Measurable Outcome: Based on 2019-2020 iReady final diagnostic for grades 3rd - 6th, the percentage of students scoring one or more grade levels below was 37.25%. As compared to 2020-2021 Ready diagnostic 1 for 3rd - 6th, the percentage of students scoring one or more grade levels below was 52%. Students in grades 3rd-6th scoring one or more grade levels below will decrease to 40% for 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady lessons are evidenced-based and strand-specific; teachers will use the identified iReady instructional grouping table to target specific vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to COVID-19 and the current hybrid model of instruction, teachers are bound to constraints of planning for brick and mortar students as well as eLearning students. For equitable learning, the teacher will use evidenced-based strategies/activities that are provided in the iReady instructional groupings as well as the ELA Enhanced Standards Focus Document.

Action Steps to Implement

Adhere to the Instructional Agreements: The iReady ELA Standards Mastery assessment will be administered the last week of each 9-week grading period, it will be used as a formative assessment tool. Grade level teams will decide which two ELA priority standards will be assessed. Data results will be used to plan for small group instruction and re-teach if necessary using lessons from the iReady Teacher Toolbox.

Person Responsible: Pamela Dodd (dodd.pamela@brevardschools.org)

Each ELA teacher will prioritize interventions strategically and efficiently; teachers will use school wide diagnostics to determine student needs. Students will be strategically grouped to maximize effectiveness; Cape View's Title I instructional assistant will be provided a fixed schedule to push-in to support ELA core and small group instruction to take place daily.(T)

Person Responsible: Pamela Dodd (dodd.pamela@brevardschools.org)

The literacy coach (.5 T) will work closely with 3rd - 6th grade teachers on writing. Teachers will identify struggling writers; also, teachers will maintain a writing portfolio that will include students' initial writing assessment as well as monthly writing assessments. The literacy coach will create a writing conference team, and this team will plan for monthly student writing conferences focused on the elements of writing (focus, evidence, organization, elaboration and conventions).

Person Responsible: Pamela Dodd (dodd.pamela@brevardschools.org)

The literacy coach will work collaboratively during TEAM planning meetings with an emphasis on scaffolding and the rigor of the standard(s) being taught. The literacy coach will share the Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension and support teachers with implementation in the classroom.(T)

Person Responsible Pamela Dodd (dodd.pamela@brevardschools.org)

The principal and assistant principal will conduct several classroom walk throughs to observe the level of rigor and relevance, use of complex text and student engagement. Administration will provide feedback using the Instructional Planning Guide or Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool. Administration will identify instructional areas of need and meet with the literacy coach to schedule a possible coaching cycle with specific teachers for improvement.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**HISPANIC SUBGROUP:**

Based on Cape View's subgroup data, White to Hispanic, the three-year data trend indicates that when comparing White students to Hispanic students in 2019, White students outperformed Hispanic students by 21%; in 2018, Hispanic students outperformed White students by a margin of 3%; and in 2017, White students outperformed Hispanic students by 14%. As this data are reflected upon, it is necessary to revisit the instructional processes that were evident in the 2017-2018 school year to determine the successes of Hispanic students. Title I funds will be used to provide one-on-one assistance and intervention to identified, Hispanic students in grades Kindergarten through 6th grade. (T)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

2020 WIDA results indicate that 45% (5) of Hispanic students improved overall; 9% (1) of Hispanic students declined overall; and 45% (5) did not have comparable data from the 2019 school year. The WIDA data reflect that the strategies during the 2019 school year were effective. The consistent use of Lexia to implement lessons and track data made a big difference. With direct modeling and coaching by the Literacy Coach, there was a strategic change in the delivery of instruction model and best practice by the instructional assistant..

SWD SUBGROUP

Based on Cape View's ESSA subgroup data, SWD to non-SWD, the three-year data trend shows in 2019 that 37% of Non-SWD outperformed students with SWD; in 2018, 29% of Non-SWD outperformed SWD; and in 2017 50% of Non-SWD outperformed SWD. Cape View's CARES Act funds will be used to hire additional personnel (IA) to support our students with disabilities. This additional support will be used to close the ELA achievement gap for identified, students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on Cape View's 2020-2021 subgroup data, it is Cape View's goal to have 50% of Hispanic students scoring on or above grade level as evidenced by 2021 FSA Reading. This is an increase of 3% from the 2018-2019 FSA subgroup data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

One on one support from the Title I instructional assistant will bridge the gap between core instructional delivery and the diverse learning styles of the Hispanic population (T). Students will be working on Lexia lessons assigned by the instructional assistant.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to provide Hispanic students an equitable learning opportunity and engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks for ELA (whether brick and mortar or virtual), all teachers will use culturally responsive strategies (two from Professional Development).

Action Steps to Implement**HISPANIC STUDENT SUBGROUP ACTION STEPS**

1. Cape View will host two professional development trainings for all K-6 teachers (one per semester) to support a culturally responsive instruction (Teachers will be charged with implementing two of the strategies learned).
2. Provide additional ELA intervention resources to identified Hispanic students who are performing below grade level proficiency in reading.

3. Literacy Coach will plan weekly with the Title I instructional assistant on Culturally Responsive Lesson Plans. (T)
4. Progress monitor students, review data and provide reteach for Hispanic students.
5. Utilize Snap-N-Read program in the classroom, Lexia and other translations documents to support Hispanic families.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Students With Disabilities SUBGROUP ACTION STEPS

1. Literacy Coach (T) will plan weekly with the Title I instructional assistant (T), review data analysis for Students With Disabilities and create a schedule to support time with students in small group settings.
2. The resource teacher will push into classrooms for additional instructional support (exposure to core instruction) assisting our Students With Disabilities.
3. Students With Disabilities will receive more intense small group instruction from an instructional assistant (funding source Cares Act dollars).
4. Twelve in house writing mentors will be assigned to identified Students With Disabilities in order to provide the students with feedback and strategies to improve writing.

Person Responsible Pamela Dodd (dodd.pamela@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When compared to the 2019 (53%) and 2018 (55%) science state averages, Cape View consistently outperformed the state in 2018 (65%) and 2019 (59%). Yet, Cape View has witnessed a downward trend in its science data over the past three years: 2019, 59%; 2018, 65%; and 2017, 70%. On our most recent SSA Review Part I, 41% of the fifth grade students scored 60% or higher.

Measurable Outcome: Cape View's goal is to have at least 50% of the 5th grade students scoring 60% or higher on the SSA Review Part 2 Assessment. Cape View will utilize district science assessments for 4th and 5th grades to monitor students' progress towards mastery of the science standards to inform instructional practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Fifth grade students will participate in science lab activities under the direction of the science lab teachers (T) that will focus on third and fourth grade standards, identified through the SSA Review Part 1. This allows the classroom teacher to focus on grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to the length of time in which the third and fourth grade standards were taught, it is imperative that these standards be revisited during science lab time.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor science unit assessment data during monthly data chats. This data will be used to inform future science classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

The Title I Science Lab teachers (T) and the 5th grade science teacher will collaborate and plan for science instruction to ensure the fidelity of 5th grade science standards.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

An intentional instructional change was made based on science data from the 2018-2019 school year.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Provide a family night on December 9th for all families to attend virtually and learn ways to help support their child at home in science. Hands-on science activities will be purchased and sent home with every student to do with their families during this virtual event. (T)

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Currently, 42% of Cape View's parents use FOCUS as a source for parent-teacher communication, and 85% of parents use Dojo as a source for parent-teacher communication; it is of utmost importance that Cape View parents increase their use of FOCUS and Dojo to improve parent-teacher communication for the 2020-2021 school year. The lack of parent communication affects the parents' full understanding of their child's performance across all content areas.

Measurable Outcome: It is Cape View's goal to increase its parent FOCUS use to 85% and increase its parent use of Dojo to 100%. Parental use of FOCUS and Dojo are imperative to improvement of parent-teacher communication for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Run a FOCUS report to monitor parent usage. Log into Class Dojo accounts to see which parents are not actively participating.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By monitoring FOCUS and Dojo parent communication, this will allow teachers to viably see which parents are actively communicating as well as informing parents of his or her child's academic performance in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teachers will send a Dojo invitation to parents who are not actively connected to their Classroom Dojo (this will help them to create an account).

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Technology Specialist will send communication (letter) home with students regarding how to access FOCUS accounts and how to acquire a PIN access. The principal will encourage ALL parents to access their FOCUS and Dojo accounts on powerpoint slides for Virtual Open House.

Person Responsible Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All teachers will participate in 3- 2 hour Conscious Discipline professional development trainings during pre-planning through the first semester. The guidance counselor will deliver specific Social Emotional Lessons to account for COVID experiences and to help students prepare to learn and be ready for reentry into brick and mortar. Conscious Discipline will ensure a positive school cultural and provide a supportive fulfilling environment to meet the needs of all students, families and stakeholders. CD is a mindset shift necessary to help remain conscious, even in the most challenging situations such as Distance Learning and now eLearning. Trauma in the Classrooms will be delivered through 3 professional development trainings by the Guidance Counselor. Trauma-informed teachers will be able to provide our students the need to feel safe & secure in order to learn. Teachers will learn about the most important issue: Compassion Fatigue and self-care tips. These tips can also be taught to families and stakeholders (in alignment with the District strategic plan Objective A3). IPST/MTSS will work with the guidance counselor to develop a multi-tiered framework to support social-emotional learning, behavior, and mental health across the school and community (Strategy AS:S1).

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.

Insights Teacher Survey:

The 2019 Insight Survey Index was a 9.5 (92%). All domains ranked higher than the Brevard Average and Brevard Top-Quartile Responses. The Highest domain was observation and feedback (9.0) and the lowest domain was Learning Environment (7.5). The question related to teachers and leaders immediately addressing misbehavior in shared spaces such as the hallways and lunchroom. Consistency in expectations and consequences for student behavior was important to teachers. This year due to COVID-19 and CDC guidelines students will sit forward and properly spaced apart while eating in the lunchroom. This has had a positive effect on lunchroom behaviors. We will work on these two areas of the learning environment through our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Team this year. They will develop consistent expectations and consequences that are aligned with the District Discipline Plan. This will be shared at team meetings each month. This year our school was recognized as a PBIS Gold Model School for carrying out an effective school wide plan.

Youth Truth Student Survey:

The results of the student Youth Truth Survey Executive Summary shows areas of strength to be Culture and Engagement. Engagement Percent Positives rated 86% as compared to 90% typical Youth Truth school and 89% typical Brevard school. Culture (18%) was rated similarly to the typical Youth Truth school

score of 20% and that of typical Brevard schools also at 18%. 63% of the students responded positively to the question, "Do you feel safe at school?"

The opportunity for growth lies in the area of Relationships with teachers and Instructional Methods. Cape View students rated relationships at 66% as compared to typical Youth Truth school of 79% and typical Brevard schools at 89%. Even though students responded that they felt their teacher cares about them, they specifically said that they need extra help from the teacher during class and want their teacher to be fair to them. In addition, Cape View responded with 38% positive as compared to typical Youth Truth score of 53% and typical Brevard school was at 47%. Students responded that they don't like the instructional methods used in class to learn.

Parent Survey Results:

Cape View Parent Survey was overwhelmingly positive. The area that stood out the most was how we communicate school information and events with parents and share student progress. 85% of parents were extremely happy with using text messages via Dojo app. Also, 95% of parents responded that they feel welcome at school? We hold school events on evenings and days that are convenient and susceptible to parent and student attendance. 86.6 of parents liked planned Title I Nights at school. They also like having academic support materials sent home so they can work with their child at home. Areas for growth and improvement were convenient meeting times for all and using tools we have at school to track performance ie., 42% of our parents are currently signed up for FOCUS. We will work to get 85% signed up and using FOCUS this year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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