

Brevard Public Schools

# Cape View Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

## 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: 7/1/2013

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (69%)<br>2017-18: B (57%)<br>2016-17: A (65%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## 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<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-6                        | Yes                    | 94%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 27%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | A       | A       | B       |

### 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 will focus on intentional planning to provide standards-aligned instruction, using high quality materials and resources with fidelity to meet the academic needs of all students.

Revised 21-22 SY

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

All Cape View stakeholders will work to cultivate a safe and welcoming environment, by providing a positive, cohesive and engaging atmosphere.

Revised 21-22 SY

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name            | Position 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. |
| Brooks, Suzanne | Assistant Principal | As assistant principal, I support the principal and teachers in providing an effective, positive learning environment. In this position, I monitor the fidelity of the curriculum, instruction and assessment. I also provide teachers with valuable feedback regarding standards-aligned instructional practice.   |
| Dodd, Pamela    | Reading Coach       | As literacy coach, I work closely with school leadership and teachers; I serve as a stable resource for professional development and monitor student data throughout the school year to generate continued improvement in ELA. I work within all aspects of the coaching cycle to hone teachers' academic craft so that they may continue to plan and deliver effective instructional practices.  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, 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

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

264

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

0

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

2

### 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                              | 41          | 34 | 36 | 30 | 32 | 37 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 242   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 17          | 10 | 10 | 5  | 10 | 12 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 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 FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 4  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 5  | 4  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

**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 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/31/2021

**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               | 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 |       |

**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               | 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     |

## 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             |        |          |       | 63%    | 62%      | 57%   | 67%    | 60%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 61%    | 60%      | 58%   | 60%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 77%    | 57%      | 53%   | 58%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 73%    | 63%      | 63%   | 57%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 78%    | 65%      | 62%   | 51%    | 59%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 71%    | 53%      | 51%   | 41%    | 49%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 59%    | 57%      | 53%   | 65%    | 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 | 63%    | 64%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 61%      | -9%                        | 58%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 70%    | 60%      | 10%                        | 56%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 60%      | 3%                         | 54%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -70%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 65%    | 61%      | 4%                         | 62%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 64%      | -1%                        | 64%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -65%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 68%    | 60%      | 8%                         | 60%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 85%    | 67%      | 18%                        | 55%   | 30%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -68%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 56%      | 2%                         | 53%   | 5%                      |
| 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 Data for both ELA and Math was used to progress monitor for three diagnostic windows (Fall, Winter and Spring)

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 60%  | 76%    | 90%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 67%  | 88%    | 100%   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 71%  | 83%    | 86%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 41%  | 55%    | 82%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 50%  | 63%    | 89%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 14%  | 50%    | 14%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | 100%   |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 19%  | 33%    | 51%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 17%  | 40%    | 48%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 17%  | 67%    | 67%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 50%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 17%  | 42%    | 48%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 17%  | 42%    | 40%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50%  | 67%    | 50%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 35%  | 49%    | 71%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25%  | 40%    | 48%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 20%  | 40%    | 60%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 100%   |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 24%  | 41%    | 48%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 30%  | 40%    | 48%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 40%  | 60%    | 60%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 66%  | 65%    | 83%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 58%  | 68%    | 82%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50%  | 70%    | 70%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 15%  | 24%    | 57%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16%  | 21%    | 53%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 10%  | 10%    | 28%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | 31%    | NA     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 43%  | 52%    | 77%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 45%  | 55%    | 81%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 75%  | 50%    | 100%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 100%   |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 27%  | 50%    | 56%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25%  | 50%    | 62%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50%  | 25%    | 50%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 6               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 41%  | 58%    | 77%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 29%  | 47%    | 71%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 0%     | 43%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 20%  | 54%    | 59%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 12%  | 50%    | 62%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 33%    | 67%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | NA   | NA     | NA     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 31              | 27            |                    | 28               | 50             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 20              |               |                    | 50               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 38              |               |                    | 57               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 67              | 71            | 58                 | 62               | 58             | 54                  | 54              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 59              | 58            |                    | 54               | 61             |                     | 38              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 41              | 54            | 47                 | 30               | 50             | 47                  | 47              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 70              | 85            |                    | 48               | 23             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 77              |               |                    | 62               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 66              | 58            | 56                 | 57               | 56             | 44                  | 68              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 66              | 60            | 55                 | 52               | 44             | 19                  | 58              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 60  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 421 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |     |

| 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%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 35  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| 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%                  |     |
| 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% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 48  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| 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%       |     |



| White Students   |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students   | 61 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |    |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |    |

## 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?

ELA Grade Level Data:

6th grade ELA showed a decline of 7 percentage points from 2019 to 2021; 63% (2019) to 56% (2021). This score also reflects a decline of 6 percentage points between school and district in 2021.

Math Grade Level Data:

-3rd grade math showed a decline of 26 percentage points from 2019 to 2021; 65% (2019) to 39% (2021). This score reflects a decline of 15 percentage points between school to district in 2021. Also, a 12 point decline between school and state was evident in 2021.

-5th grade math showed a decline of 11 percentage points from 2019 to 2021; 68% (2019) to 57% (2021)

-6th grade math showed a decline of 18 percentage points from 2019 to 2021; 85% (2019) to 67% (2021)

SWD ELA Subgroup Comparison (Grades 3-6):

28% of SWD students scored at Level 1 or 2 (below proficiency) on FSA ELA compared to 63% of SWD students scoring at Level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA in 2021. This is a difference of 35 percentage points.

SWD Math Subgroup Comparison (Grades 3-6):

38% of SWD students scored at Level 1 or 2 (below proficiency) on FSA Math compared to 66% of SWD students scoring at Level 1 or 2 on FSA Math in 2021. This is a difference of 28 percentage points.

Content Area 3-Year Data Trend:

See next box for 3 year trend data.

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

After reviewing Cape View's ELA achievement data over the past three years, the following areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are: (1) ELA LG L25% (2) Math LG & (3) Science

**Content Area 3-Year Data Trend:**

ELA overall achievement reflects a slight decline (2021, 62%; 2019, 63%; 2018, 67%) -1

ELA LG trend shows improvement (2021, 66%; 2019, 61%; and 2018, 60%). +5

ELA LG L25% shows a significant decline (2021, 60%; 2019, 77%; and 2018, 58%) -17

Math achievement reflects a decline (2021, 60%, 2019, 73%, 2018, 57%) -13

Math LG reflects a decline (2021, 62%, 2019, 78%, 2018, 51%) -16

Math LG of lowest 25% reflects a decline (2021, 59%, 2019, 71%, 2018, 41%) -12

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

Contributing factors to these two areas for needs improvement are virtual learning that was offered as an option for students during the 2020-2021 school year; and the learning gap that remained evident for those students who failed to thrive during eLearning at the end of the 2019-2020 school year (March-May). Non-proficient readers struggled with understanding rigorous tasks in response to reading. Actions will be taken to accelerate learning through core instruction for all students and scaffolding and intervention through teacher-led small group instruction. Differentiated instruction will be provided using the Teacher toolbox: Ready Instruction, Tools for Instruction and Personalized Instruction depending upon the student data and grouping needs. Taxonomy of the lessons will be considered and a gradual increase in rigor will be a strategy used.

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

ELA LG three-year trend shows improvement (2021, 66%; 2019, 61%; and 2018, 60%).

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

During fall professional development 2020-2021 school year, all 3rd - 6th grade teachers were trained on the use of iReady's Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension. Also, teachers analyzed iReady ELA data with fidelity and utilized their class' instructional grouping information to implement instructional recommendations. In addition, the Literacy Coach provided numerous mentoring and coaching opportunities for our 4th grade teachers through modeling rigorous writing strategies from December through March.

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

iReady's Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension can be used with the district's new ELA curriculums: Benchmark Advance (3rd-5th) and Savaas (6th). Teachers will follow the district's Benchmark Advance and Savaas timelines for whole and small-group instruction to include Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension. Also, teachers will select tasks from the iReady Toolbox for Tier 1 acceleration. Teachers will provide rigorous and specific learning tasks during small group instruction. Again, lessons will be differentiated based on defined deficits to meet the needs of On Level, One Grade Level below, and Two Grade Levels below students (personalized instruction plan). Also, teachers will provide relevant background knowledge and plan for necessary opportunities to build content vocabulary.

**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.**

During the opportunity for advanced planning, teachers in K-5 were offered Benchmark Advance Launch Unit training; grade 6 was offered the opportunity for advanced planning in Savaas.

Benchmark Advance Quality Assessment training was offered for grades 4 and 5.

Ongoing training and support is available for all teachers as related to Benchmark Advance and Savaas. This may be in the form of what to use during small-group instruction (Tier 1 instructional support), online supports for teachers, writing supports, and progress monitoring.

Professional development opportunities for teachers will be offered in utilizing resources from i-Ready math tool box and using progress monitoring tools within i-Ready to identify struggling students. Yearly Pacing for Prerequisites provides opportunities to weave prerequisite content into grade-level work and pacing suggestions to keep learning on track. Unit and Lesson Support provides tips for supporting students as they engage in grade-level content.

Professional development opportunities will be offered to teachers in the use of iReady tasks and digital tools to accelerate learning. These will include, but are not limited to, ways to intentionally scaffold lessons and expand content vocabulary knowledge.

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

Classroom observations will be made by administration and staff to observe the level of student engagement, DOK questioning and the use of academic vocabulary in all content areas.

Primary classroom observations will be focused on Benchmark Advance's core instructional materials, tasks and assignments that meet the rigor of the new benchmarks (writing tasks and response to reading).

Intermediate classroom observations will be focused on student discourse to include questions, explanation and reasoning using mathematical language. Students will be able to engage in productive discussion using strategies provided through scaffolding.

A certified teacher will provide academic support/small group instruction for ELA and math in order to address the needs of the lowest performing students.

Geometry will be infused at the beginning of the school year so students get early exposure to geometry skills.

There will be a school-wide science and math vocabulary focus.

Lexia will be used for progress monitoring SWD reading foundational skills.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | After analyzing 2021 FSA data, Cape View's ELA L25% data reflect a decrease from 77% (2019) to 60% (2021). As a result of eLearning and the lack of direct instruction, teachers will progress monitor and provide supports for identified students while attending to Tier 1 instruction (acceleration).  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The classroom teacher will be responsible for monitoring the students' pass/fail rate via the students' instructional pathways. The ELA lowest 25% will be progressed monitored for improvement between Diagnostic 1, Diagnostic 2 and Diagnostic 3.<br><br>The expectation of implementing these action steps should demonstrate an increase on FSA of 3 percentage points (63%).   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | The classroom teachers will monitor students' iReady instructional pathway results (pass/fail rate) and this will be discussed and tracked during data chats. Also, the teacher will use data from the Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension to plan learning tasks and differentiate instruction.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teachers will determine which skills support students as they work toward grade level comprehension outcomes. Each ELA strand has corresponding resources under Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension available through iReady. The Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension guide offers teacher recommendations for addressing unfinished learning. Teachers support students through teacher-led small groups each week based on student data from iReady. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Teachers have been trained in the use of Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension to close the gap caused by unfinished learning. Teachers are knowledgeable about the use of iReady tools to support student learning.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration will observe the use of Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension by using data focusing on skills needed to close the gap from unfinished learning for all students.

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

2. Teachers will utilize the iReady Instructional Grouping Report to strategically maximize effectiveness of small group instruction in order to accelerate learning.

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Brooks (brooks.suzanne@brevardschools.org)

3. The literacy coach (.5 T) will lead the Literacy Leadership Team to identify struggling writers. Students will work with an assigned writing coach. Assigned coaches will conduct conferences focused on the six elements of writing. Teachers will maintain a writing portfolio for identified students for the purpose of tracking improvement. Writing samples will come from Benchmark Advanced writing topics and the Saavas Reading program.

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

4. A certified teacher will provide differentiated intervention through Academic Support, twice a week (Tuesdays and Thursdays) for 3rd and 4th grade students who are substantially deficient in ELA. This will include our Students With Disabilities, which is designated time in addition to Rtl in the general education classroom. The teacher will use Phonics for Learning materials and vocabulary mini lessons with this group.(T)

**Person Responsible** Nichole LaMarr (lamarr.nichole@brevardschools.org)

5. Classroom teachers will administer the Standards Mastery Assessments in grades 3-6, every nine weeks, according to our Instructional Agreements. The leadership team and administration will monitor and review this data with the classroom teacher. This will give students the opportunity to grapple with depth of the standard and teachers information about how the students understood the standard.

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

6. During data chats, we share ELA L25% information and spreadsheets for how many points are needed to make an ELA learning gain. Administration will progress monitor this data at each monthly meeting and discuss next steps with classroom teachers.

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

7. Cape View will offer all kindergarten parents an opportunity to participate in a Literacy Night on October 6, 2021. It is important for teachers to communicate early on grade appropriate expectations so that parents know how to support their child at home with literacy. Materials will be provided on this night and teachers will model reading strategies and how to use the purchased materials to support literacy and learning at home. (T)

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** After analyzing 2021 FSA data, Cape View's Math learning gains data reflect a decrease of 16 percentage points, from 78% (2019) to 62% (2021). As a result of eLearning and the lack of face-to-face direct instruction, student math achievement suffered greatly.

**Measurable Outcome:** The classroom teacher will be responsible for monitoring the students' pass/fail rate of the instructional program. Math learning gains will be progressed monitored for improvement between Diagnostic 1, Diagnostic 2 and Diagnostic 3.

The expectation of implementing these action steps should demonstrate an increase of 3 percentage points from 62% to 65% on FSA Math learning gains.

**Monitoring:** The classroom teachers will monitor students' iReady Math instructional pathway results (pass/fail rate) and this will be tracked and discussed during data chats. Also, the teacher will use data from the Math Prerequisites lessons to plan targeted skills/tasks to differentiate instruction.

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will utilize recommendations from the Math Prerequisite guide to address unfinished learning. Teachers will determine which math strand and corresponding Math Prerequisite resource to use to support student learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers have been trained in the use of iReady Math Prerequisites to close the gap caused by unfinished learning. Teachers will implement tasks from the iReady Teacher Toolbox to support their small group instruction, beginning in October. Teachers will address small group instruction at the beginning of each math block.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Classroom observations will be focused on student discourse to include questions, explanations and reasoning using mathematical language. All students will be able to engage in productive discussion using strategies provided through scaffolding. A Look For tool similar to the ELEOT will be used.

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

2. A certified teacher will provide differentiated intervention through Academic Support after school two days per week (Tuesdays and Thursdays) for students who are substantially deficient in Math.

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Brooks (brooks.suzanne@brevardschools.org)

3. Classroom teachers will provide exposure to geometry skills earlier in the school year by utilizing Math Prerequisite lessons to plan targeted skills/tasks due to the gap created by unfinished learning (March-May, 2019-2020).

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Brooks (brooks.suzanne@brevardschools.org)

4. Materials such as white boards and hands-on manipulatives such as multiplication cards, games, and fraction kits will be purchased to support math strategies and family engagement opportunities at home. Teachers will be encouraged to create their own math YouTube videos OR purchase the Connected Classroom for instructional use and review of foundational skills at home. (T)

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Brooks (brooks.suzanne@brevardschools.org)

5. Classroom teachers will administer the math Standards Mastery Assessments in grades 3-6, every nine weeks, according to our Instructional Agreements. The leadership team and administration will monitor and review this data with the classroom teacher. This will give students the opportunity to grapple with depth of the standard and teachers information about how the students understood the standard.

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

6. During data chats, we share Math L25% information and spreadsheets for how many points are needed to make a math learning gain. Administration will progress monitor this data at each monthly meeting and discuss next steps with classroom teachers.

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



**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | After analyzing 2021 SSA data, Cape View's Science scores reflected a decrease of 6 percentage points, from 58% (2019) to 52% (2021). After careful analysis of student data, we noticed that there were similarities between the number of students who earned Level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA and the number of students who earned Level 1 or 2 on SSA.               |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Cape View's most recent Grade 5 SSA Prep (part 1) Assessment on Penda Science, 40% of the fifth grade students scored 60% or higher. Cape View's goal is to have at least 60% of the 5th grade students scoring 60% or higher on the Grade 5 SSA Prep (part 2) Assessment on Penda Science.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Cape View's Penda Contact, administrators and teachers will utilize Penda Science program for 3rd - 6th grade to monitor students' progress towards mastery of the science standards to inform instructional practice.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Michelle Wedel (wedel.michelle@brevardschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Fifth grade students will participate in science lab activities under the direction of the science lab teachers (T) who will focus on third and fourth grade standards with a key focus on Nature of Science, identified through the Grade 5 SSA Prep (part 1) Assessment on Penda Science. This allows the classroom teacher to focus on grade level standards. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Due to unfinished learning and eLearning, many 5th grade students missed face-to-face science instructional delivery and missed hands-on investigations, and as a result, did not master all of the grade-level specific science standards.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The Title I science lab teacher (T) and Penda Contact will analyze Penda data to collaborate and provide feedback to 3rd - 6th grade teachers regarding instructional best practices.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Wedel (wedel.michelle@brevardschools.org)

2. 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 standard; and will develop standards-based science investigations that will take place in the science lab and during classroom science instruction.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Wedel (wedel.michelle@brevardschools.org)

3. Cape View will provide a Virtual Family Night in October for all families to learn ways to support their child at home in science. Hands-on science activities will be modeled. Science materials will be purchased and sent home with every student in order to participate with their families during this virtual event. (T)

**Person Responsible** Michelle Wedel (wedel.michelle@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.

**On the School Safety Dashboard Cape View Elementary reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the Very Low category. Cape View Elementary's discipline data ranked #1 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. We also ranked #1 as compared to 56 elementary schools in the county. Regarding our total reported suspensions we also ranked #1 statewide and #1 out of 126. Although our discipline data is good, our school does have a substantial attendance issue to address, which has a direct impact on student learning. We will continue to use our Positive Behavior Support School Wide strategies: S.O.A.R. expectations (Safety first, On time to school each day, Actively engage in the work, Always be Respectful and Responsible). We will work with recognizing positive behaviors through Student of the Month, Principal's Lunch Bunch, recognition via morning announcements and the School Newsletter. Cape View teachers will discuss attendance with identified parents during our first parent conferences in October. Each quarter the principal will print an attendance report of students who have more than 7 days absent and make personal calls to the parents regarding the importance of direct instruction and the relationship between the number of days absent and successful learning. As a school we will continue to implement strategies from our Conscious Discipline training to support a healthy Social Emotional Learning environment for all students.**

#### **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.**

2020 Teacher Insight Survey reflects a 9.9 out of 10 result; this data reflect our staff thrives in a positive and conducive teaching and learning environment. All domains ranked higher than the Brevard average, as well as the Top-Quartile of schools. The highest observations were Peer Culture (9.6) and Observation & Feedback (9.6). The lowest domain was Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (8.5). Again, Cape View's score exceeds the Brevard average (5.5) and the top quartile of schools (7.0).

Cape View received two PBIS recognitions: Gold Model School and the Resilience Award.

The Youth Truth Survey Executive Summary shows areas of strength under Relationships (83%) & Engagement (93%). The area for improvement was Culture (37%); this is an increase of 19 percentage points from last year's survey. In comparison, Cape View's score is higher than Typical Youth Truth's (25%)

schools and Typical Brevard Schools (28%) response.

Cape View's Parent Survey was overwhelmingly positive. Several questions provided information for what Cape View is doing well and what parents feel we can do to improve the learning environment. Parents feel that communications via Class Dojo have been very successful (76%). Parents gave positive feedback (71%) about Cape View's Title I family events and appreciated the academic resources to be utilized at home.

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity for all students. Consulting with various stakeholder groups and seeking input is crucial when formulating the school's vision, mission, goals and School Improvement Plan strategies.

Community members and business partners have played an important role in supporting our students and families during a challenging health crisis. Some examples of community and business outreach include free backpacks provided to all students during registration. Jackets, snacks and food packs were collected and sent home with students in need. Local churches donated food gift cards to our most needy families. During the holidays, our lowest income families receive food baskets and gifts.

Local organizations such as American Legion, Cocoa Beach Woman's Club, Kiwanis Club and Rotary Club are instrumental in providing valuable resources to our most needy families.