Cape View Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cape View Elementary School

8440 ROSALIND AVE, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

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

Demographics

Principal: Jill Keane E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2020-21: (60%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](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
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	
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 by providing an effective, positive learning environment. In this position, I monitor the fidelity of the curriculum, delivery of instruction and aligned assessments. I also provide teachers with valuable feedback regarding standards-aligned instructional practice. Another role I am involved with is professional development to support our School Improvement Plan goals & action steps.
Dodd, Pamela	Instructional Coach		As literacy coach, I work closely with school leadership team and teachers. I serve as a stable resource to provide standards-aligned professional development and work directly to support new teachers by modeling for the teacher and observing implementation of the new best practice with fidelity. I also monitor student data throughout the year to help teachers find the appropriate resources and intervention strategies/ tasks to use with students. 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 practice.
Wedel, Michelle	Other	Title 1 Science Lab Facilitator (T)	My primary responsibility as a Title I Teacher (T) is planning and executing hands on science labs for students in grades 3-5. I also assist the fifth grade classroom teacher with science planning and reviewing science standards for testing. I coordinate and oversee Parent Family Engagement Activities for our Title I Family Nights. I am responsible for collecting and documenting Title I Federally required documents for our frameworks. I help to monitor the Title I Budget and share information during SAC and CNA meetings with parents. I ensure we spend our Parent and Family Engagement funds on things that support our students academically at home and with activities during our family nights.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Travers, Sherry	Other	Title 1 - Science & Gifted	As a part time (.5 day) Title I Teacher(T), my responsibilities focus on planning and executing hands on science lab activities for grades 3-5 on a regular basis/ rotation. I support the classroom teachers with science resources and planning (fifth grade science standards support this year, pushing into the classroom during science). I attend STEM field trips with students to support science standards and instruction and lessons when the students return to campus. An example would be the September field trip for five separate weeks to Starbase. I plan activities and competitions for our students to attend that help to challenge them in the area of science and math, such as the Innovation Games. I assist Ms. Michelle Wedel with planning for our Title I Family Nights for parents / students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Jill Keane E

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.*
5

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Total number of students enrolled at the school
300

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
3

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	39	42	34	42	37	39	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	8	14	4	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/19/2022

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	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**	**12**	
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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	41	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	12	
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

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	64%			62%			63%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%			66%			61%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%			60%			77%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	59%			60%			73%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%			62%			78%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%			59%			71%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	49%			52%			59%	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	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	60%	10%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

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	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2022					
	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	56%	2%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	41	58	64	33	58						
HSP	43			57							
MUL	73			73							
WHT	69	65	56	61	65	59	59				
FRL	56	59	47	54	59	64	48				
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	31	27		28	50						
ELL	20			50							
HSP	38			57							
WHT	67	71	58	62	58	54	54				
FRL	59	58		54	61		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	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				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
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	55
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?

FSA ELA 3+ three-year trend data:
-3rd grade 63% (2019); 64% (2021); and 53% (2022)
-4th grade 52% (2019); 69% (2021); and 58% (2022)
-5th grade 70% (2019); 66% (2021); and 61% (2022)
-6th grade 63% (2019); 56% (2021); and 77% (2022)

FSA Math 3+ three-year trend data:
-3rd grade 65% (2019); 39% (2021); and 69% (2022)
-4th grade 63% (2019); 69% (2021); and 64% (2022)
-5th grade 68% (2019); 57% (2021); and 32% (2022)
-6th grade 85% (2019); 67% (2021); and 66% (2022)

Subgroup three-year trend data:
SWD ELA Proficiency 32% (2019); 31% (2021); and 41% (2022)
SWD ELA LG 71% (2019); 27% (2021); and 58% (2022)
SWD L25% 82% (2019); NSA (2021); and 64% (2022)

SWD Math 54% (2019); 28% (2021); and 33% (2022)
SWD LG 62% (2019): 50% (2021); and 58% (2022)
SWD L25% (no trend data available)
HSP ELA Proficiency 57% (2019); 38% (2021); and 43% (2022)
HSP Math Proficiency 80% (2019); 57% (2021); and 57% (2022)

Decline in 3rd & 4th ELA from 2021 to 2022, falling below the district average of 58 in third and 60 in fourth.
Significant decline in 5th grade math from 57% in 2021 to 32% in 2022, falling below the average of both district (56) and state (52).
Decline in science scores over three years scoring 1 pt. above state (48) but below the district average of (55). 2022 fifth grade score reflecting 49% scoring at proficiency.
SWD making gain from 31% to 41% in ELA.

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

Based on iReady Diagnostic 3 & 2022 FSA ELA scoring 3+, the greatest need for improvement is ELA in 3rd and 4th grade. Although, our ELA subgroup for SWD proficiency data shows an increase from 31% to 41%, we still must show improvement to remain well-above the federal index level of 41%.

Based on iReady Diagnostic 3 data & 2022 FSA Math, the greatest need of improvement is in 5th grade math, Numbers and Operations in Base Ten.

Based on the Statewide Science Assessment in 2022 & progress monitoring from Penda Science, scores have slowly decreased over the past three years. This year 49% of the students scored at proficiency which was above the state (48) but below the district (55).

Contributing Factors to Science Scores:
Science data, as evidenced by SSA, has declined 10 percentage points over four years (2019-2022).

New Actions:
*Title I science teachers will continue with science labs - supporting instruction with third and fourth grade
standards. They will also push-in to the fifth grade science classes to support the classroom teacher with fifth
grade standards.
*Meet and collaborate with at least two Title I cohorts to see what strategies were used at their schools to improve
their science scores
*Meet in vertical teams: Grades 3, 4, 5 to plan for Life Science and Earth Science instruction
*Plan Starbase Field Trip (T) for fifth graders for hands-on STEM activities that cover the fifth grade Earth /
Space standards (once per week for five weeks in September)

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 3rd-4th grade ELA data 2019-22:

*Higher number of ESE and ELL within 3rd grade 2021-2022
*Integration of knowledge and ideas is a difficult strand due to limited exposure and lack of experience to formal

writing to include elaboration/citing evidence
*Teacher student ratio in ESE classroom18:1 for SY 2021-2022
*Last year two ESE units were collapsed
*Planning for multiple grade levels became challenging for our ESE teacher; scheduling with general education
teachers was extremely complicated and interrupted instructional flow

New Actions:

Addition of an ESE primary resource support facilitation teacher in Aug. 2022 to reduce student/teacher ratio
Utilization and progress monitoring of Lexia lesson with 1st-3rd grade intervention groups as well as SWD and HSP subgroups. Teachers will analyze iReady and Lexia grade level instructional grouping reports to inform instruction (discussed during data chats)
Streamline MTSS process and intervention for SWD, HSP and students below the 15th percentile on iReady Reading. These students will receive tiered intervention which will be provided.

Contributing Factors to Fifth Grade Math Scores:
Fifth grade math has declined 36 percentage points over the past three years. Math Team expressed students struggle with multi-step word problems/academic vocabulary.

New Actions:
Building math stamina through the engagement of word problems that spark productive struggle. Students will use tools and strategies such as: visual representation/manipulatives and metacognitive strategies to solve problems. This will include academic vocabulary terms to explain solutions to word problems.

Teachers will use iReady math prerequisites groupings to plan for small group instruction.

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

6th grade ELA (+21 points FSA from prior year) and 3rd grade Math (+30 points FSA from prior year), both are also well above district and state averages for FSA.

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

The district adopted a new 6th grade ELA curriculum, and the district's ELA team wrote lesson overviews to cover all BEST standards with an emphasis on writing.

3rd grade focused on targeted-intensive math instruction with an emphasis on academic vocabulary and word problem strategies.

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

iReady Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension will be used in conjunction with Benchmark Advance and Savvas pacing guides. Teachers will select tasks from iReady Toolbox for Tier 1 acceleration. For small group intervention instruction (Tier 2), Lexia lessons will be utilized to accelerate learning. K teachers will utilize PASI screeners along with 95% Group Phonological Awareness lessons to accelerate learning. First through third grades will utilize the PSI screener along with the Phonics Lesson Library to accelerate learning. Students with disabilities (SWD) will be monitored in I-Ready and supported with Lexia instruction (e.g. phonics).

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.

MTSS/IPST training was provided to all teachers during the first three weeks of school; PSI training was offered to support intervention instruction; Lexia training for new teachers to support SWD, HSP and students receiving intervention. Collaborative planning was organized with grade levels as well as VE personnel.

New teachers will be trained on iReady Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension and iReady Math Perquisites. Professional development 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.

Math BEST training was offered to all teachers in July in order to familiarize themselves with the district's new math series. The new math coach is providing modeling and support to the new sixth grade math teacher. The math coach is also providing support during teacher planning on Mondays to help with new math pacing and resources.

New Actions:
Literacy Leadership Team will ensure that all grade levels know and understand B.E.S.T. K-12 ELA expectations AND clarifications within the grade level benchmark. This will be addressed during the four professional development opportunities throughout the year. Classroom walk-throughs will include monitoring of Benchmark Advance phonics/word study skills to improve vocabulary. ELA Writing Team and administration will review student writing samples against the B.E.S.T. Writing Rubric to ensure fidelity of the scoring process.

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

After-school tutoring for ELA and Math; district math coach to support new teachers with the new math curriculum; district ESE content specialist to support self-contained and resource ESE teachers. The district has provided more PD trainings in the areas of special content areas such as co-teaching, VE and content-specific trainings. Sustainability will be met through the use of iReady, Lexia and Penda progress monitoring tools.

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	After analyzing 2022 FSA ELA data, Cape View third graders scored 53% proficiency which is an 11 point decline from the previous year and below district average. Fourth grade FSA ELA data reflects 58% proficiency compared to the previous year which was 69%, this is also an 11 point decline. This is below the district average of 60%. Cape View's ELA subgroup for SWD proficiency data shows an increase from 31% to 41%, we must show improvement to remain well-above the federal index level of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Expectations and Measureable Outcomes from the STAR Literacy Screener (ELA) from PM1 to PM3 for grades K-2. FAST data will be used for grades 3-6: K: 69% (PM1) of the students scoring At / Above Benchmark; (PM3) 75% will score At or Above Benchmark 1: 55% (PM1) of the students scoring At / Above Benchmark; (PM3) 60% will score At or Above Benchmark 2: 75% (PM1) of the students scoring At / Above Benchmark; (PM3) 80% will score At or Above Benchmark 3: 26% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 65% will score at proficiency 4: 43% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 75% will score at proficiency 5: 39% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 75% will score at proficiency 6: 39% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 75% will score at profiiency
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	iReady student achievement (instructional pathway pass rate of 70%) will be monitored by 3rd and 4th classroom teachers and administration. The 3rd grade teacher will accelerate learning for substantially deficient students utilizing the PSI screener to drive lessons from the Phonics Lesson Library. The 4th grade teacher will accelerate learning of low performing students utilizing iReady Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and student performance will be monitored during data chats. Examples of data monitoring will include VPK, STAR Early Literacy; K STAR Early Literacy; first grade STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading; second grade STAR Reading; third through six FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the	Progress monitoring of iReady pass/fail rate, fluid intervention groups to include weekly and bi-weekly progress monitoring using research-based tools. Administration will analyze data from instructional assessments, to include writing samples, during data chats, TEAM meetings and grade level meetings. (Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan).

evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	School Literacy Leadership Team will ensure that consistent professional development is provided to help teachers integrate phonemic awareness, phonics, word study and spelling, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension strategies into a explicit, systematic and sequential approach to reading instruction. Another evidenced-based practice is the implementation of High Leverage Strategies as modeled through a series of videos during professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Following the K-12 Reading Plan and Just Read, Florida Coaching Model supports improvement in K-6 literacy instruction and student achievement. High Leverage Strategies videos were created and sent to us from the district to use with our teachers to support delivery and instructional best practices (research based).

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.

Third and fourth grade iReady instruction will be monitored by classroom teachers and administration via iReady classroom instruction report. Teachers will implement small group instruction to close gaps in learning.

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

Third grade will receive training on Phonics Screener Inventory (PSI) and the Phonics Lesson Library (PLL) in order to provide targeted intervention (small group instruction) to close learning gaps.

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

Fourth grade ELA teacher will utilize iReady Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension to address unfinished learning.

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

Administration and literacy coach will conduct consistent classroom walk throughs to ensure teachers are implementing evidence based reading instruction with fidelity. Also administration will observe and provide feedback to teachers to increase instructional density to meet the needs of all students.

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

School Literacy Leadership Team (including Literacy Coach (T)) will provide multiple PD opportunities (including high leverage practices, MTSS etc.) and coaching for classroom teachers to gain sufficient knowledge to support best practices and increase literacy achievement. This will occur during Early Release Friday PD and during teacher planning for individual teachers.

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

The principal will provide professional development called, Utilizing High Leverage Strategies In The Classroom, on October 17, 2022 during our TEAMS meeting to share best practice with ALL classroom teachers. She will also follow up with observing the implementation of those high leverage strategies in the classroom.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	After analyzing SWD ESSA Subgroup Data the three year trend from 2019-2022 shows an increase from 31% to 41% which meets the Federal Index minimum target.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students with Disabilities will increase their Federal Index percentage for ELA by three percentage points, 41% to 45%. STAR Early Literacy (Renaissance Reports) VPK through first grade. STAR Reading will be used for second grade. These reports offer baseline data that allows teachers and administration to monitor student achievement and growth over the course of a school year. The reports indicate literacy proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitor individual subgroup data via iReady Report group/ subgroup (SWD). Students in VE self contained and ESE first and second grade will be monitored via Lexia Data. Administration will also monitor STAR screening reports, starting with fall baseline data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The teacher will use Lexia with identified students (SWD) to improve foundational reading skills. The PSI will be used to identify gaps in learning to form small intensive intervention groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Lexia and PSI are research based strategies proven to increase student achievement in the area reading.

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.

Training new teachers for Lexia and PSI/PLL within the first four weeks of school. Also follow up of implementation of Lexia and PSI/PLL will be conducted by the Literacy Coach to ensure fidelity.

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

During grade level MTSS meetings, as well as grade level data chats, students receiving Lexia instruction or tiered intervention will be progress monitored closely.

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

All teachers will be trained on and implement High Leverage Practices for SWD. Classroom walkthroughs will focus on implementation of these practices.

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

#3. 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.	Based on FSA Math 2022 data our fifth grade scores reflect a 25 percentage pt. decline from the previous year (2021). Cape View's math achievement score (32%) also fell below that of district (56%) and state (52%).
	Expectations and Measureable Outcomes from the STAR Math Screener from PM1 to PM3 for grades K-2. PM1 to PM3 FAST data will be used for grades 3-6:
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	K: 84% (PM1) currently scoring At or Above Benchmark; by (PM3) 85% will score At or Above Benchmark 1: 78% (PM1) currently scoring At or Above Benchmark; by (PM3) 80% will score At or Above Benchmark 2: 85% (PM1) currently scoring At or Above Benchmark; by (PM3) 85% will score At or Above Benchmark 3: 21% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 50% will score at proficiency 4: 22% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 70% will score at proficiency 5: 16% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 60% will score at proficiency 6: 15% (PM1) of the students scoring at proficiency (Level 3-5); (PM3) 55% will score at proficiency
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored via iReady reports and Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. Additionally, classroom walkthough's will be implemented to monitor and provide feedback on math instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Keane (keane.jill@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	New math curriculum aligned to B.E.S.T. standards that include the identification of Benchmark Clarifications for each benchmark. Also use iReady Instructional Grouping Report, iReady Prerequisites and iReady Toolbox lessons. Another evidenced-based practice is the implementation of High Leverage Strategies as modeled through a series of videos during professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	Teachers will be able to use the benchmark clarifications to to better understand the what the benchmark encompasses. The iReady instructional grouping report offers teachers insight on how to support math groups (five groups / lessons to support). iReady prerequisites will provide teachers with lessons to support unfinished learning. High Leverage Strategies videos were created and sent to us to use with our teachers to support delivery and instructional best practices (research based).

specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Addition of a math coach to work with all the classroom teachers on evidence based strategies listed above. This will include modeling / co-teaching with new math series.

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

New math series and B.E.S.T. teacher training prior to pre-planning. Literacy coach (T1 .5) will train new teachers on the iReady instructional grouping report on how to support math groups (five groups / lessons to support). iReady prerequisites will provide teachers with lessons to support unfinished learning.

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

The vertical math team will meet monthly to discuss effective math strategies such as visual representations, metacognitive strategies, kinesthetic teaching, use of manipulatives, as well as the use of academic vocabulary to demonstrate understanding of the math concepts for all tiers of instruction.

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

A highly effective state VAM teacher was assigned to 5th grade as a departmentalized math teacher to support closing gaps and accelerating math.

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

Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor and provide feedback to teachers on implementation of BEST standards, new curriculum and use of small group instruction to accelerate/ remediate student learning.

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

The principal will provide professional development called, Utilizing High Leverage Strategies In The Classroom, on October 17, 2022 during our TEAMS meeting to share best practice with ALL classroom teachers. She will also follow up with observing the implementation of those high leverage strategies in the classroom.

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

#4. 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.**	Cape View's three year trend in science data reflects a decline of ten percentage points from (59%) 2019 to (49%) 2022. The 2022 science data on FSA is above the state (48%) but below the district (55%). 35% of Cape View's fifth grade students earned a 60% or better on SSA Part 1 for August 2022.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Cape View's fifth grade will increase six percentage points in the area of science on FSA proficiency (55%) for 2023. Our target for the SSA Part 2 will be for 55% of our students to meet or exceed 60% or higher. Baseline on SSA1 was 35% scoring at 60% or higher.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Science mastery data will be monitored by third, fourth and fifth grade teachers using the Penda Science Program. Cape View also will use the SSA review Part 1 results through a pre and post assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Wedel (wedel.michelle@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Student implementation of the Penda Science lessons with fidelity. Teachers and Science Team will progress monitor all third, fourth and fifth grade student data so that teachers can plan for and target specific science topics / areas of concern.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	More than one teacher will be analyzing all grade level science data to make informed decisions.

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.

To address Earth and Space Science Standards fifth grade students will attend the five week Starbase STEM hands-on field trip (T) sponsored by the Department of Defense.

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

Science Team, led by two Title I teachers (T), will monitor science data to include mastery of SSA1 standards, discuss effective science strategies and provide feedback to grades three, four and five. This will also inform weekly hands-on lab instruction.

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

Cape View will collaborate with a Cohort School which performed substantially well on the FSA Science. The purpose of this collaboration is to learn about strategies that worked well with their student population, similar demographics.

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

Two Title I Teachers (T) will lead third and fourth grade students in science lab activities to provide standards based activities, focusing on Life Science Strand and Earth / Space Strand.

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

Two Title I Teachers (T) will push into fifth grade science classes to support standards based learning. They will support the classroom teacher with planning for standards aligned instruction in order to build efficacy of evidence-based practices.

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

A highly effective state VAM teacher was assigned to 5th grade as a departmentalized science teacher to support closing gaps in science.

Person Responsible   Jill Keane (keane.jill@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.

Cape View embraces a positive school culture and learning environment that will empower all students to reach their full potential. We are very proud of our PBIS Gold Model status to recognize students for their model behavior and for following school wide expectations: S- safety first, O- on time and in attendance every day, A- actively engaged in listening and learning, R- demonstrate respect and responsibility at all times. We invite all stakeholders to participate in engagement and family activities such as four scheduled Family Nights on campus, a Literacy Night for all during Hispanic Heritage Month (October 4th, 2022), music programs and National Night Out with the City of Cape Canaveral. Materials and supplies (T) for family nights will be utilized for take home activities. Many of surveys reflect our positive school culture such as our Teacher Insights Survey with a data point of 10.0 which is the 97% of positive responses to questions in multiple domains. These percentages were well above and exceeded both district and Top Quartile rankings. The Youth Truth Student Survey also shows that students feel safe at school and a sense of belonging (highest themes). Our BPS parent survey reflects that parents feel welcome and that their child's teacher is doing a good job. The survey reflects that parents want more opportunities to participate in school functions and events. We have provided a calendar of events for parents during registration. Additionally, parent communication in English and Spanish has occurred through classroom DOJO and schools newsletters.

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

Stakeholders pay a significant role in school performance and ensuring increased equity for all. This comes directly from input and feedback through surveys and meetings such as School Advisory Council and our Parent Teacher Organization. Seeking all stakeholder input is crucial to formulating a successful vision, mission and goals for our School Improvement Plan. Cape View has always been very active; working with the community, business partners and parents to support student growth and achievement. Stakeholders have played an important role in helping to remove barriers to student achievement. Local churches and organizations such as American Legion, Rotary, Cocoa Beach Women's Club and other outreach programs have provided snacks, shoes, clothing, teacher/ student supplies, jackets in the fall, and holiday food baskets to show our families how much they care and want to be involved. This year one business partner

and prior school alumni donated $75K to provide a new soccer field and irrigation system to the school because it would be great for our child to have a new field.