Cambridge Elementary Magnet School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School

2000 CAMBRIDGE DR, Cocoa, FL 32922

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

Demographics

Principal: Regina Tagye M

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School

2000 CAMBRIDGE DR, Cocoa, FL 32922

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tagye, Gina	Principal	Develops and shares a vision of academic success including the allocation of fiscal and human capital resources. Monitors effectiveness of vision through classroom walkthroughs, Instructional Rounds with District Leaders and data analysis to ensure all systems align within the school community in order to improve student achievement. Serves as the Instructional Leader of the building. Leverages resource to provide teachers with the tools to support high quality learning and instruction. Models instructional practices through participation in collaborative planning and school wide professional development. Coordinates the development of an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports to ensure students with need are provided with additional supports to achieve success. Leverages school leadership team members, teachers, and any additional staff that may be able to offer support in their area of expertise. It is through these meetings that discussions of classroom assessment data, grade level data trends, teaching strategies, curriculum, progress monitoring, and student behaviors are analyzed. If implemented interventions do not show an increase in student performance, a new or more intensive approach is developed.
Ziccardi, Evelyn	Assistant Principal	Shares a vision of academic success . Monitors effectiveness of vision through classroom walkthroughs, Instructional Rounds with District Leaders and data analysis to ensure all systems align within the school community in order to improve student achievement. Serves as an Instructional Leader of the building. Works with the principal to leverage resources to provide teachers with the tools to support high quality learning and instruction. Models instructional practices through participation in collaborative planning and school wide professional development. Coordinates the development of an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports to ensure students with need are provided with additional supports to achieve success. Leverages school leadership team members, teachers, and any additional staff that may be able to offer support in their area of expertise. It is through these meetings that discussions of classroom assessment data, grade level data trends, teaching strategies, curriculum, progress monitoring, and student behaviors are analyzed. If implemented interventions do not show an increase in student performance, a new or more intensive approach is developed.
Gleason, Rita	Teacher, K-12	Support struggling students with intervention. Collaborate with Leadership team in the decision making process
Clarke, Devane	Teacher, K-12	6th grade Classroom teacher working on Ed Leadership degree. Is a part of the school leadership team.
Estes, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher Leadership Team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Mentor for new teachers PD Facilitator for ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 1/6/2019, Regina Tagye M

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

489

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

16

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	59	60	48	55	78	63	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	424
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	7	6	11	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	1	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	35	30	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	39	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	18	5	32	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	9	2	1	7	26	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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	60	51	53	73	68	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	9	5	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	1	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	17	34	34	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA Assessments	0	0	0	7	35	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math Assessment	0	0	0	6	38	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	48	63	76	85	68	79	78	0	0	0	497
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	21	17	19	14	18	14	0	0	0	110

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	60	51	53	73	68	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	9	5	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	1	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	17	34	34	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA Assessments	0	0	0	7	35	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math Assessment	0	0	0	6	38	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	48	63	76	85	68	79	78	0	0	0	497
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	21	17	19	14	18	14	0	0	0	110

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	61%	56%				39%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						52%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						56%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	49%	50%				51%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						60%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						45%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	60%	59%				70%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	64%	-33%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	26%	61%	-35%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
06	2022					
	2019	33%	60%	-27%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	41%	61%	-20%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	64%	-25%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2022					
	2019	46%	67%	-21%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	21	8	21	36	31					
ELL	22	44	35	43	66	59	63				
BLK	29	51	40	35	48	33	59				
HSP	34	50	38	50	67	59	63				
MUL	61	71		43	59						
WHT	50	61		50	59						
FRL	42	54	34	47	59	42	65				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	42	47	22	50	58	7				
ELL	24	46	47	42	67	44	25				
BLK	26	51	60	31	61	67	32				
HSP	25	46	47	44	63	44	30				
MUL	50	67		50	53						
WHT	44	55		41	47		67				
FRL	31	49	59	40	62	55	38				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	43	45	26	44	37	7				
ELL	31	52	64	45	61	61	70				
BLK	30	52	55	41	56	36	62				
HSP	35	49	58	47	58	58	64				
MUL	52	53		55	57						
WHT	53	57		68	69		91				
FRL	36	50	54	51	60	46	66				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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 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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53

Hispanic Students	
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	59
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	55
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Fourth grade ELA FSA scores were very low. The scores were lower than iReady predicted. Fifth graders scored 8 percentage points higher than iReady predicted for ELA.

Learning Gains in ELA increased by 4 points, ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% decreased by 13 points
In Math, 4th grade scored 18% points higher than iReady predicted.
Learning Gains in Math increased by 6 points. Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% decreased by 3 points.
Overall, FSA scores went up in ELA for levels 3 and above by 6 percentage points. Math increased by 6 percentage points. ELA proficiency continues to trend below district and state averages.

Science increase by 26 percentage points.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area for greatest need is ELA. State assessments show that 62 percent of 3rd-6th graders are reading below grade level. While that is a decrease from 68 percent, it is still very concerning. Learning Gains for the lowest 25% (ELA) was 40 percent, down from 55%.

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

The ELA teacher of two thirds of the fourth grade quit in December. The changeover along with already low scores in this grade level group did not help. The school is currently searching for a new ELA teacher for 5th grade. This will be critical to consistent instruction for these students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science from 41% to 67%

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

Strong Science teacher on the activity wheel and strong 5th grade science teacher. No new actions were taken.

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

Teacher recruitment and retention strategies in order to have a qualified high performing teacher in every classroom is the priority. As of the beginning of August, 10 instructional positions, including Literacy Coach and interventionists are still vacant.
We are planning a Lit Camp for students who are struggling with reading. This would include our after school tutoring and Saturday school. We want to instill a love of reading as students are learning to read.

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.

We began preplanning with a day of ELA professional development, establishing the Cambridge expectations and way of Tier 1 instruction including small group instructional and intentional, meaningful learning centers.
Monthly ELA PLCs will offer opportunity for short bursts of PD and discussion around literacy instruction.

We will also use the FL Literacy Instruction Practice Profile as the basis for PD bursts, ELA walkthroughs, and focused feedback opportunities with individual teachers. (explicit, systematic, differentiation, scaffolding and corrective feedback)

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

We will utilize ESSER and district Academic Support Program funds to provide ELA tutoring.
We anticipate receiving the 21st Century Grant for our after school child care program that would provide tutoring for up to 65 students. We will look to invite students on the "bubble" of ELA proficiency.

We will also plan purposeful Family Engagement activities around Literacy to help parents continue to learn how to support their children at home with literacy.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	iReady Math Diagnostic 3 scores showed 43% of all students working on or above grade level, an increase from 12% at the beginning of the year. While this shows good growth, we continue to work toward our goal of 100% of students working on/above grade level in both subjects. Twenty-eight percent of our SWD demonstrated proficiency on the end of year iReady Math diagnostic. 2022 FSA scores: Math 3-5 46% up from 40% This is still below district and state trends. Math Learning Gains 59% (same as previous year) Math L 25 Learning Gains 45% down from 48% Math instruction will be designed to create a more engaging learning environment that: • will allow for greater student discourse • facilitates students doing the "heavy lifting" of the lesson • provides a more targeted approach to instruction to meet the individual needs of the students. Collaborative structures within the math block will be utilized to increase student engagement, facilitate student discourse and immerse students in the "work" of learning.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022-23, the iReady Math Diagnostic 2 students will show at least 55% of students will be working at or above grade level. FAST Scores goals for 2022-23: Math Proficiency: 55%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor growth using : • Use End of Unit Assessments • iReady D1 and D2 • PM1 and PM2 – state
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Tagye (tagye.gina@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning with teachers and the Math Coach using standards aligned quality resources. Scaffolding with prerequisite skills necessary for Core Instruction to be successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate and are given instructional feedback and coaching. Scaffolding provides the necessary supports in applying new information and helps students make connections with prior knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Begin Implementation of BEST standards and newly adopted district program aligned to BEST. (Focus on the core!)
Build fluent retrieval of basic math facts.
Daily exit tickets/quick checks to inform instruction for upcoming lessons.

Math Coach will work with teachers on pacing and planning to increase standards aligned instruction.
Teachers will use feedback from coaches and administrators to improve instruction.
Math Coach will work with teachers to model/co-teach lessons and provide support when needed.
Collaborate with district for planning, modeling, curriculum support, observational walk-throughs with feedback that focuses on student engagement, discourse, visual representation, and hands-on learning during the math block. (This supports SWD, ELL and all students)

ASP - utilize our ASP program to accelerate learning including scaffolding, vocabulary instruction, and independent thinking

Person Responsible   Evelyn Ziccardi (ziccardi.evelyn@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Last year, 67% of 5th grade students scored a level 3, 4, or 5 on the Science State assessment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is for 70% of 5th graders to score on or above on the state assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Use of Penda Pre and Post test for Zoo School
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Tagye (tagye.gina@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Hands on, exploration and real world application at Zoo School (T). Hands on activities support all students, including ELL and ESE. We anticipate having a Science teacher on the activity wheel (T). We are struggling to hire.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Engaging with instruction via immersion in the zoo environment. Having a teacher to support science instruction has been a benefit to our school for several years.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Fifth grade will take a pre and post test to demonstrate growth

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

D3 iReady data from 21-22 shows that 20% of Kindergarten, 52% of first grade and 61% of 2nd graders were not on track to score on or above grade level on the statewide ELA assessment.

With the continued implementation of new BEST standards and new ELA programs K-2, Tier I instruction will be our focus. A consistent school wide commitments for the flow for Tier 1 instruction: Foundations, Close Reading, Writing, Small Groups. Explicit teaching with a renewed focus on the "You Do" will be Planning sessions that support the components of this structure.

We will continue walk to intervention to identify missing skills and work with students to close those gaps. We are seeking to fill critical positions including Literacy Coach (T) and interventionists.(T) we will use Lexia (T) to support Tier 3 for grades K-3.

We will continue classroom walkthroughs as a tool to identify trends in primary levels.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

21-22 ELA FSA Data showed that 62% of 3-6 grade students scored levels one or two. (63% of 3rd grade, 56% of 4th, and 53% of 5th graders scored level one or two.) ELA proficiency continues to trend below district and state averages.

As we increase primary literacy achievement, the gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3-5.
With the continued implementation of new BEST standards and new ELA programs K-6, the structure of our Tier I instruction will be a focus. A consistent school wide commitments for the structure of Tier 1 instruction: Foundations, Close Reading, Writing, Small Groups

We will continue walk to intervention to identify missing skills and work with students to close those gaps.

We are seeking to fill critical positions including Literacy Coach (T) and interventionists.(T) we will use Lexia (T) to support Tier 2 for grades 3-6.

We will continue classroom walkthroughs as a tool to identify trends in intermediate levels.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short term: From FAST STAR PM 1 to PM 2, literacy acheivment will increase by 10%
Long term: At least 60% of students in K-2 will demonstrate proficiency on the Spring 2023 ELA FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short term: From FAST PM 1 to PM 2, literacy acheivment will increase by 10%
Long Term: At least 50% of students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate proficiency on the Spring 2023 ELA FAST.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use iReady (D1 and D2) and FAST(PM1, PM2, and PM3) to progress monitor
Walkthroughs with feedback
Benchmark Advance/Savvas assessments
Intervention data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tagye, Gina, tagye.gina@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

• Explicit instruction, Systematic instruction, Scaffolded instruction, Differentiated Instruction, Corrective Feedback
• Lexia (Strong level of evidence)
o Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards
o Systematic and structured approach to the six critical areas of reading
Science of Reading domains include PA, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension
• 95% Group (Strong level of evidence)
• Collaborative Planning
• i-Ready (Promising level of evidence)
• Benchmark Advance
o Implementation of high-quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, & comprehension
o Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction & reinforcing the "why" – Science of Reading
Parent Engagement events will include Literacy Night with guidance for parents on how to support students in the area of reading. Books will be provided to families to build their home libraries (T).

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Job embedded professional development and coaching will be provided. (LIt Coach position is open. District Literacy coach will support for the interim)
All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as they are:
o B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
o Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
o Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
o Systematic and/or Explicit
o Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Development began with 5.5 hours focused on Tier 1 instruction, The Science of Reading and the 6 ELA Expectations, Explicit Teaching, Multisensory Learning, Small Groups and Centers well as Teach Like a Champion Strategies that will be used in all classrooms (Threshold, Wait Time, Right is Right, No Opt Out) Literacy Leadership: o Define roles and responsibilities of team members before, during and after common planning sessions. o Establish Principal-Coach partnership agreement to specify duties and activities of the coach and how the Principal will provide support (could mean eliminating duties for the coach and establishing criteria for determining who the coach will work with during the school year). Assessment o Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM o Daily exit tickets, other formative assessments Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to identify areas for growth and possible PD "quick bursts".	Tagye, Gina, tagye.gina@brevardschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2022-2023 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and a student survey called "youth truth". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.
• The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school
(92% yes), helpful and polite office staff (88% responded "always"), 71% responded that they communicated with parents either weekly or monthly, 90% reported communicating with their child's teacher about the students progress at least monthly, and 89% responded that they are satisfied with the relationship and communication with the principal.

An area of improvement included: Increase parents accessing Focus for grades and communication.

• Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for BPS in the following
categories: Academic Challenge, Instructional Methods, Culture, and Belonging. These focus areas will be addressed with the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising the level of rigor in daily instruction. We will survey our students to get their input on improving these areas.

• Our faculty insight survey identified areas of strength that included School Operations, Observation & Feedback, Evaluation, and Peer Culture. Target areas for improvement include Learning Environment and Academic Expectations.

Our CNA team (T) identified ways to support teachers such as providing resources for Restorative Circles to support positive classroom relationships. The PBIS team worked this summer to identify strategies to celebrate positive behaviors through classroom menus for spending Cougar Cash, lunchroom and activity charts to monitor students following expectations and class rewards for meeting expectations consistently. The ELA Planning team met to plan for consistent school wide expectations for Tier 1 instruction and conducted PD during pre planning to support all teachers with effective strategies for high levels of instruction.

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

Engaging ALL Stakeholders
• The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic
and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.
• Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are able to meet grade level expectations"). Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups.

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

• Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:
•Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in dis aggregated data •The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles.

Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up
with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and
other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours,and
offer translation). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-
served students.