

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

Central

Cambridge Elementary Magnet School

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Sandy Demmon

Hilah Mercer

SAC Chairperson:

Michelle Zeppieri

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To inspire and empower lifelong learning

Vision Statement:

A model community of excellence and success

Brevard County Public Schools

School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

This year's significant changes in how school grades were calculated negatively impacted Cambridge's school grade points when compared to the previous three years. The inclusion of English Language Learners with 1 year or more of service and Students with Disabilities in the percent scoring at or above standards, along with the increased requirements for achievement levels, contributed to a dramatic decline in our score/grade. Changes to the way FCAT Writes was scored to include conventions such as use of standard English, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling also had a negative impact.

The prior three years data for students scoring at or above standards has been somewhat stagnant across content areas and at an unacceptably low rate. Last year Cambridge earned its highest number of points used to calculate school grades in its history. This year our school showed a significant decline. Our total points dropped from 561 to 474 (- 87). Percent at or above standard in reading declined from 69% to 52% (-17%). Percent at or above standard in math declined from 72% to 51% (-21%). Percent of students scoring at or above standard in writing declined from 95% to 72% (-23%). Percent at or above standard in science declined from 50% to 37%

(- 13%). Points for learning gains in math declined from 71 to 69 (-2); and math points for the learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 85 to 60 points (- 25). In a reversal of the decline noted in other areas, points for learning gains in reading increased from 64 to 69 (+ 5 points); and reading points for learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 55 to 64 (+ 9). Subgroup data is included in Appendix A.

An analysis of FAIR reading comprehension data, measured as median percentile rank, demonstrated an increase at every grade level 3 – 6. 3rd grade increased from 35% to 47% (+ 12%); 4th grade increased from 33% to 48% (+ 15%); 5th grade increased from 25% to 49% (+ 24%); and 6th grade increased from 36% to 64% (+28%). It can be noted that the median percentile rank for FAIR increased with each ascending grade level, most significantly for grades 5 and 6.

Using the 2011 -12 Student Survey, students rated the desire to achieve success at 86%. 89% stated they strongly agreed or agreed that their school would help them later in life. The decline in our 2012 FCAT results does not provide support to their desire to achieve or their belief their school will help them later. When students in grades 4 – 6 were surveyed electronically regarding their reading and writing preferences 84% responded that they like to read. 67% preferred literary (fictional) text over informational text. Definitions of terms were provided with the survey. 55% stated they would prefer to read an imaginary story like *Charlotte’sWeb* instead of a factual book about spiders, but 56% of the students stated they would prefer an informational book about snakes over a literary, fictional one. 73% of our students responded they preferred to write an imaginary, make believe story instead of a factual paper to explain or report on something. Our 2011-12 Parent Survey results showed high ratings in all areas. However, when parents rated how well their students were learning 21st Century skills the two areas needing the most improvement were: organization skills and how to deal with real world issues. Teachers at all grade levels were surveyed electronically regarding their awareness of their use of literary and informational text to create a balanced literacy program. 81% were not tracking the type of text they were utilizing for instruction prior to our decision to use balanced literacy and writing in response as the focus of our 2012-13 SIP. 97% replied that they anticipated a staff development initiative facilitated by Sharon Tolson of FDLRS using the book *Make It Real: Strategies for Success with Informational Texts* would assist them in improving students use and understanding of informational text.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

The most examined and monitored current practice aimed at improving student achievement at Cambridge is the use of collaborative learning teams to create a school wide professional learning community. Grade level or job function teams meet weekly to collaborate and plan instruction base on these four essential questions designed to impact student achievement:

1. What do we want our students to know? (rigorous aligned curriculum)
2. How will we teach it? (research based instructional strategies and practices)
3. How will we know if students know/it don’t know it? (common formative assessments)
4. What will we do when they do/don’t know it? (response to intervention/multi-tiered system of support)

Notes to these meetings are submitted to an administrator weekly. The objective of the practice is to ensure all students gain the knowledge and skills demanded by the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (grades 3 – 6) and Common Core State Standards (K – 2) and they receive the support needed through a collaborative professional effort. As a result of our 2011-12 School Improvement plan, our teams identified norms and protocols to guide them in working together. They analyzed student achievement data and established SMART goals to improve the level of achievement they were working interdependently to attain. Progress

monitoring toward achievement of these goals was on-going and displayed for view by the teams. Teacher team members aligned lesson plans and instruction to match the state and district standards and high stakes testing requirements. Teams utilized pacing guides and adapted them to meet students' instructional progress. Required prerequisite knowledge was assessed and data was utilized to assist students in acquiring the knowledge and skills they lacked. Frequent common formative assessments were used by collaborative teams to make decisions regarding student grouping, movement in the instructional hierarchy, and to design intervention strategies for those students who needed assistance. Teachers tracked student progress on data walls and analyzed progress directions and rates. Our focus was on the utilization of collaborative learning teams to provide the strategies. We inspected and monitored the Professional Learning Community processes which were a vehicle to achieve improved student achievement.

Teacher teams focused on the four essential questions. However their planning and strategy practice was broad and centered on collaboration and addressing the questions rather than centering in on the precise implementation of research based instructional strategies proven to increase student achievement.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

Current research clearly indicates we must balance our reading instruction, increasing our use of informational text. Writing in response to reading, including informational text, across all curriculum areas is shown to enhance student learning. Dr. Max Thompson sites research conducted by Dr. Robert Marzano, serving as the Director of the Mid-Continent Regional Education Lab (McREL) 2001, which found that five high yield research-based strategies most significantly increased learning and student achievement. He found the following research based strategies improved student achievement in all content areas: extended higher order thinking strategies, summarizing by the learner, teaching vocabulary in context, utilizing advanced organizers, and using non-verbal representations in the learning process. The two highest yield strategies were the use of higher order thinking strategies and the use of written summary strategies by students, with writing requirements distributed across the duration of lessons in all content areas.

Research by Duke, 2003, reveals that while adult reading material includes a far higher amount of informational text than literature, less than 10 percent of 1st grade classroom libraries are comprised of informational text. He states that young students need to learn about the range of purposes that text can serve to prepare for the increasing demands of real life. This research supports Common Core initiatives. Increased access to informational text better motivates many students who have strong interests in the topics addressed in such text, or this type of text is their overall preference. (Caswell & Duke, 1998; Jobe & Dayton-Sakari, 2002). Research evidence clearly demonstrates students need to learn the differences between various kinds of text and the consequences of these differences for their reading processes (Symons, MacLatchy-Gaudet, Stone & Reynolds, 2001).

Listening to informational text is a valuable tool for building knowledge, especially when combined with hands-on investigations (Anderson & Guthrie, 1999). Research also suggests that students are more likely to select informational text for independent reading if their teacher has read it aloud to them. (Dreher & Dromsky, 2000). In a study, 2nd and 3rd graders whose teachers encouraged more authentic reading and

writing of informational text and how-to texts in science showed higher growth in reading comprehension as well as in writing (Purcell-Gates & Duke, 2003). Instruction that emphasizes reading to learn and sharing information with others has proven effective in increasing students' engagement, application of strategies, and comprehension (Guthrie, 2003). Research by Vanezky, Duke, and Parks, 2000, suggests that at least 86% of the texts read by adults are informational. Calkins, Montgomery, Santman, and Falk found that standardized tests across the United States are now comprised of anywhere from 50 – 85% informational texts. In January 2002, Education Week reported a study comparing American students with students from other countries of the world. The study showed that while American nine-year-olds scored first in the world in assessments of literacy, American fourteen-year-olds dropped to seventh. The study went on to suggest that educators need to shift the focus of instruction to complex informational texts, providing more time and more classroom instruction in those texts from kindergarten up. Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) contains a review of the research stressing the importance of being able to read complex text of all types texts for success in college and career. CCSS emphasize informational text so prominently because it is challenging and complex, it has deep comprehension-building potential, and because the use of informational text is an opportunity to help students learn how to engage, interact, and have conversations with the text in ways that prepare them for the type of experiences that they will encounter in college and careers. Comprehension of informational text is highly purposeful and interactive (Honig, Diamond, & Gutlohn, 2000). Comprehensive research by Pflaum, Walberg, Karegianes, & Rasher, 1980; Crismore, Raphael & Kintsch, van Dijk, Anderson & Hidi, 1998; and Bangert-Drowns, Hurley, & Wilkinson, 1991; found significant increases in achievement when summarizing was imbedded in lessons. The research confirmed that writing summaries requires students to create a personalized, parsimonious account of information gleaned from an experience. All forms of writing, embedded in lessons across all content areas, involve a complex process which requires "thinking written down." According to Schwartz, Klein, & Shook in *Interactive Writing and Interactive Editing*, 2001, research consistently supports reciprocal development of reading comprehension and writing proficiency. Writing to summarize, clarify, explain, give examples or explanations, in all content areas, increases comprehension of concepts and ideas which leads to higher achievement across content areas. The National Commission on Writing (2003) emphasized the importance of devoting more time to writing instruction and that writing should be assigned across the curriculum.

A 2008 Policy Research Brief produced by the National Council of Teachers of English notes that student writers enter the classroom with diverse needs and skills, including multiple languages, grammars, cultures, and extracurricular literacy practices. This enhances the need for various approaches and assessments in order to decrease the gaps between more advanced and less advanced writers. Attention to gaps is especially important because writing acts as a gatekeeper; weak writing skills limit school, job, and advancement opportunities. These research findings directly correlate to Common Core goals for students to be college or career ready at high school graduation. The brief further stated that current research on writing makes clear: instructional practices, writing genres, and assessments should be holistic, authentic, and varied. The goal should be to prepare students for a variety of disciplinary contexts. The research suggests that a holistic approach to instruction and assessment across disciplines will give students the tools they need to develop

as writers. Research by Purcell-Gates, V. Duke, & Martineau (*Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1) show that from early developmental years to graduate student courses, students' explicit knowledge of the features and expectations of specific genres increases authentic and purposeful engagement with writing and reading. Our school objective will be supported by research based action steps to increase the probability of reaching our objective. Directly involving students in tracking their achievement data while setting improvement goals has proven to increase achievement across all content areas. Research by Wise & Okey, Lipsey & Wilson, and Walberg, 1993, support the strategy of students setting learning goals to produce positive effects on their achievement. Formative assessment data allows students to observe, chart, and analyze their progress toward goal attainment. Additional research provides evidence that supports the use of student data tracking and goal setting. Moss & Brookhart, 2009; Seidle, Rimmele, & Prenzel, 2005; and Stiggins, Arter, Chappuis, & Chappuis, 2009 demonstrated that student goal setting helps students to better understand the learning process and builds meaningful engagement in the learning process as they track their progress to the goal. To improve instructional effectiveness Cambridge staff will focus on creating a reading program that balances instructional use of literature and informational text while increasing writing requirements and informational text in lessons across content areas. The need to improve student achievement is so compelling another high yield strategy will be included as an action step. Specifically, students will set academic achievement goals based on teacher feedback while tracking their formative and summative assessment progress.

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Cambridge staff will balance the instructional use of literary and informational text, while embedding written response requirements throughout lessons, in all content areas.

Strategies: (Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. The need to utilize the instructional practices addressed in the book early in the year.	1. Read and conduct a guided book study: <i>Make It Real, Strategies for Success with Informational Text</i> by Hoyt	Sharon Tolson, Director FDLRS East Cambridge Staff Collaborative Learning Teams	Book Study - August – April Read book by December	\$1,600.00	Monthly written evaluation tool completed for each study session.
2. Need for a monitoring tool/Students' need for real life experiences to make reading meaningful and relevant	2. Monitor the amount of literary and informational text used for instruction to verify 50/50% balanced literacy across curriculum areas.	Cambridge Staff Title 1 Team Administration	September - May		Weekly tracking using "Balanced Literacy Dailey Plan" from Hoyt or other approved tracking instrument including lesson plans
3. Staff development in engaging students in writing across content areas/ Students' weakness in vocabulary development/ tracking instrument(s)	3. Engage students in writing to summarize, clarify, explain, list, give examples, etc. distributed across lessons in all content areas	Cambridge Staff Sharon Tolson ("Write All About It" chapters of <i>Make It Real</i>) Administration	September - May	1,600.00	Weekly tracking tool; lesson plans that demonstrate distributed writing across lessons and content areas
4. Researching and choosing progress monitoring/ goal setting tools; Slow progress by high needs students	4. Provide, inspect, and give feedback to students using progress monitoring/goal setting tools; including data notebooks	Cambridge Staff, Title 1 Team, Administration	September - May	\$300.00 for data notebooks and printing tracking charts	1 st – 6 th Progress tracking/goal setting tool(s) – including data notebooks/ pre-K and kindergarten utilize alternative teacher directed charts
5. Scheduled time for additional staff training/ Students lack of motivation to achieve personal best	5. Participate in professional development: "Increasing Student Engagement"	Title 1 Resource Teacher, Dr. Jacqui Fraser Cambridge Staff Peer Coaches Administration	October– December All staff will receive 4 hours training on Oct. 12, 2012. 8 additional hours offered with compensation time accrual.	\$1,500.00 - approximate cost for subs due to teacher use of accrued compensation time.	Student Engagement Walkthrough Checklist for formative feedback

6. Availability of activity team teachers; Grades K and 1 excluded due to number in team	6. Utilize activity wheel teachers as our S.H.I.E.L.D. Team (Special Help In Everyday Learning Development) to support each grade level (2 – 6) one day per week, providing small group instruction and providing classroom teachers the opportunity to observe/ collaborate with other teachers and strengthen their practice with informational text and writing	Activity Teachers, Classroom teachers	August - May		Activity teachers' schedules in specific grade level; grade level collaborative team notes; observations
7. Parents who do not attend school events	7. Dinner and Data Nights to allow students the opportunity to share their academic progress monitoring and the improvement goals they have established for themselves.	Classroom teachers, Title 1 Teachers, Administration	December	\$1,000.00 for food and drinks	Data collections sheets designed for goal setting; sign-in sheets; teachers serving as surrogate parents during school hours to assist students in reflecting on data and goals.

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Collaborative learning teams, in tandem with Title 1 support teachers, peer coaches, and administration, will ensure that the action steps delineated are completed by teachers. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly collaborative team meetings, observations with feedback, and examination of the in-process monitoring tools will provide qualitative and quantitative data to measure the level of implementation of the professional practices specified. The tracking tool for balanced literacy, which can include Hoyt’s “Balanced Literacy Dailey Plan” or other approved tools will document the % of literacy and informational text across content areas.

Teacher reflection and collaborative interaction with all team members will be used to determine if unforeseen barriers must be addressed to ensure all are in compliance. Teacher reflection will also be used to determine if further supports are required to meet outcomes. The electronic surveys, one for students and one for teachers, utilized to establish a baseline of informational text used in August will re-administered in May. There will be a 50/50 percent balance of literary and informational text across the curriculum.

The majority of lessons across content areas will contain explicit writing components dispersed across the lessons. Teachers may choose to highlight student writing components within lesson plans, or they may use the tracking chart they are provided, or they may develop and have approval. Reflection upon authentic and purposeful engagement with writing and reading across content areas will be addressed regularly at weekly collaborative team meetings.

Students in grades 1 – 6 will maintain data charts or data notebooks that contain progress monitoring data tracking progress toward a goal set by the student with support and guidance from the teacher. Student data charts, with on-going progress monitoring and goals included will be examined by collaborative teams and administration on a monthly basis.

A minimum of 80% of teachers will be rated Medium to Very High on the Student Engagement Walkthrough Checklist following scheduled staff development with time to implement strategies from the workshop.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

Dr. Max Thompson defined effective performance as at least 90% of all students reading and writing on grade level and at least 80% of all sub-groups meeting adequate yearly progress. Our school staff and students will require time, effort, action and extraordinary commitment to reach this effective level of performance. Increased reading instruction focused on informational text, in conjunction with writing in response across all content areas is anticipated to improve our performance on FCAT 2.0 which still assesses the NGSSS. The model provided by ambitious but attainable Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO's) that aim to decrease the number of students in levels 1 and 2 by 50%, over a 6 year period, was used to set quantitative measures of student achievement using FCAT 2.0. 2013. DRLA results in reading/language arts, math results on the fall inventory and winter, spring, and end of year math tests, and District writing assessments will be carefully monitored for instructional implications along with classroom formative assessments. Qualitative measures of

student achievement will be gathered by comparing the results of student surveys completed in September and May. Self-reflection as indicated in students' progress monitoring and goals setting will also be utilized.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
	<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	34% (88) of students tested achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0) on the reading section of the 2012 FCAT	38% (98) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0) on the reading section of the 2013 FCAT
	<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	N/A	N/A
	<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	18% (48) of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) in reading on the 2012 FCAT	21% (55) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) in reading on the 2013 FCAT

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>100% (2) students achieved at or above proficiency (level 7 or above) on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2012</p>	<p>100% (2) of students will achieve at or above proficiency (level 7 or above) on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2013</p>	
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>	<p>64% (28) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT</p>	<p>68% (30) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT</p>	
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Students attendance in Academic Support Program (ASP)</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Implement an Academic Support Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:		AMO's 2013 Targets	
Baseline data 2011-12:			
Total:	54%		
Black:	46%		
Hispanic:	49%		
White:	62%		
ELL:	42%		
SWD:	44%		
Economically Disadvantaged:	51%		
		Total:	58%
		Black:	51%
		Hispanic:	53%
		White:	66%
		ELL:	48%
		SWD:	49%
		Economically Disadvantaged:	56%

Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of reduction in performance to meet Safe Harbor	
White:	35% (22) of students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	30% (19) of the students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	
Black:	53% (40) of students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	48% (36) of the students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	
Hispanic:	56% (39) of students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	N/A	
Asian:	N/A	50% (35) of the students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	
American Indian:	N/A	N/A	
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): The language barrier of the students and the language barrier of the parents is an obstacle in the students' learning.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1. Students are placed in classrooms where the teachers are certified in ESOL, or are currently working to complete their certification. Teachers use ESOL strategies to help student achievement. The ESOL teacher supports the classroom teachers through pullout during walk to intervention.</p>	64% (23) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	58% (21) students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	

<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Limited English Vocabulary</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Students are given Spanish-English dictionaries and are given instruction on how to use them by the ESOL teacher. Students are encouraged to use the dictionaries while completing class work throughout the instructional year, and will use on the FCAT reading test.</p>			
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Limited funding</p> <p>Strategy(s): 3. Implement an After School Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 4. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>			
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Computer accessibility</p> <p>Strategy(s): 5. Utilize Learning Today computer based program to access and instruct according to individualized reading level.</p>			
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	52% (22) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	47% (20) students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Adequate personnel to consistently cover small instructional groups.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Form Walk to Intervention groups in grades K-6 and provide differentiated instruction based on individual needs in order to close achievement gaps.</p>	51% (124) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	46% (112) students will not make satisfactory progress in reading	
<p>Barrier(s): Students attendance in Academic Support Program (ASP)</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Implement an Academic Support Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 46% (33)	See ELL Strategies	See ELL Strategies	ESOL Teacher and Administration
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 33% (24)	See ELL Strategies	See ELL Strategies	ESOL Teacher and Administration
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: 31% (22)	See ELL Strategies	See ELL Strategies	ESOL Teacher and Administration

1. Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): No anticipated barriers Strategy(s): 1. Use FCAT Focus as an instructional tool in additional to an assessment tool in grades 3-6 including utilization of hard copies when appropriate.	34% (83) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the mathematics section of the 2012 FCAT	36% (93) of the students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the mathematics section of the 2013 FCAT	
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): No anticipated barriers Strategy(s): 2. Use FCAT Focus as an instructional tool in additional to an assessment tool in grades 3-6 including utilization of hard copies when appropriate.			
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Teacher availability Strategy(s): 3. Primary teachers model CCSS math instruction practices for intermediate teachers			
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	N/A	N/A	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	17% (43) of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT	20% (50) of students will achieve above above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT	

<p>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): Teachers who lack the knowledge and/or will to adequately differentiate math instruction</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>2. Use the Envision Enrichment component to challenge higher achieving students and challenge higher order thinking and sound reasoning.</p>			
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment:</p> <p>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	100% (2) of students scored at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2012	100% (2) of students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2013	
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment:</p> <p>Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	100% (1) of students made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2012	100% (1) of students will make learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2013	
<p>FCAT 2.0</p> <p>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): Limited funding</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1. Implement an After School Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>	60% (28) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT	64% (30) of the students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT	
<p>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>2. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>			
<p>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): Teacher availability</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>3. Primary teachers model CCSS math instruction practices for intermediate teachers</p>			

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>100% (1) of the students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment in 2012</p>	<p>100% (1) of the students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment in 2013</p>															
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline Data 2010-11:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="126 583 506 913"> <tr><td>Total:</td><td>57%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black:</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic:</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>White:</td><td>62%</td></tr> <tr><td>ELL:</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>SWD:</td><td>40%</td></tr> <tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged:</td><td>54%</td></tr> </table>	Total:	57%	Black:	52%	Hispanic:	52%	White:	62%	ELL:	52%	SWD:	40%	Economically Disadvantaged:	54%		<p>AMO's 2013 Targets</p>	
Total:	57%																
Black:	52%																
Hispanic:	52%																
White:	62%																
ELL:	52%																
SWD:	40%																
Economically Disadvantaged:	54%																
		<p>Total:</p>	<p>61%</p>														
		<p>Black:</p>	<p>57%</p>														
		<p>Hispanic:</p>	<p>57%</p>														
		<p>White:</p>	<p>65%</p>														
		<p>ELL:</p>	<p>57%</p>														
		<p>SWD:</p>	<p>46%</p>														
		<p>Economically Disadvantaged:</p>	<p>58%</p>														

<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of reduction in performance to meet Safe Harbor</p>	
<p>White:</p>	<p>33% (21) of students did not score at or above grade level</p>	<p>27% (17) of the students will not score at or above grade level</p>	
<p>Black:</p>	<p>57% (43) of students did not score at or above grade level</p>	<p>27% (17) of the students will not score at or above grade level</p>	
<p>Hispanic:</p>	<p>54% (38) of students did not score at or above grade level</p>	<p>51% (38) of the students will not score at or above grade level</p>	
<p>Asian:</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>American Indian:</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>49% (34) of the students will not score at or above grade level</p>	
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher availability Strategy(s): 1. Primary teachers model CCSS math instruction practices for intermediate teachers</p>	<p>56% (20) of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics</p>	<p>50% (18) of students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics</p>	

<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Limited funding</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Implement an After School Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 3. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>			
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Computer accessibility</p> <p>Strategy(s): 4. Utilize Learning Today computer based program to access and instruct according to individualized math level.</p>			
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Primary teachers model CCSS math instruction practices for intermediate teachers</p>	60% (25) of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	52% (22) of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Limited funding</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Implement an After School Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 3. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>			

<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Primary teachers model CCSS math instruction practices for intermediate teachers</p>	56% (136) of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	50% (120) of students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Limited funding</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Implement an After School Program (ASP), to include low performing students, where direct and computer assisted instruction will be provided.</p>			
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Teacher absences/personnel availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 3. Provide small group Walk to Intervention daily for a minimum of 30 minutes to provide for direct instruction in demonstrated areas of weakness.</p>			

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

<p>Barrier(s): No anticipated barriers</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Use Title 1 money to hire substitutes in 4th grade to allow teachers time to conference one on one with students and focus on student areas of need in writing</p>		
<p>Barrier(s): Title 1 Teacher availability</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. Provide additional instructional support through the use of a Title 1 Writing teacher to each 4th grade teacher during the Writing block so that instructional groups can be formed based on student areas of weakness in writing.</p>		
<p>Barrier(s): No anticipated barriers</p> <p>Strategy(s): 3. Use Title 1 money to hire substitutes in 4th grade each semester to allow teachers time to meet with the District Writing Resource Teacher to analyze and develop writing lesson plans based on data from scored writing papers</p>		
<p>FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing</p>	<p>72% (46) of the students scored at or above proficiency (level 3.0 or higher) in writing</p>	<p>74% (47) of the students will score at or above proficiency (level 3.0 or higher) in writing</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Lack of classroom space Strategy(s): 1. Increase utilization of science materials for hands on, inquiry based demonstrations, modeling, and lessons based on NGSSS for Science through the rebuilding of our Science Lab and placing on activity wheel for grades 2-6.		
Barrier(s): Inconsistent student attendance at after school and Saturday school Strategy(s): 2. Implement an after school and Saturday Academic Support Program (ASP), to include students scoring below 300 on Science FCAT or current 5 th grade students who are identified as low performing. ASP will provide small group inquiry based science lessons and computer assisted instruction that address the NGSSS for science.		
Barrier(s): Lack of 21 st Century technology in Zoo classrooms Strategy(s): 3. 5 th grade students will attend Zoo School at Brevard Zoo for 6 weeks where they will receive hands on experiences to address 5 th grade life science NGSSS.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	27% (19) of students achieved proficiency (Level 3) on the FCAT Science 2012	32% (23) of students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on the FCAT Science 2013
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	6% (4) of students scored above proficiency (Level 4 or 5) on the FCAT Science 2012	8% (6) of students will score above proficiency (Level 4 or 5) on the FCAT Science 2013
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	100% (1) of the students scored at or above proficiency (Level 7) on the Florida Alternate Assessment	100% (1) of the students will score above proficiency (Level 7) on the Florida Alternate Assessment

1. Science Goal(s) (High School)	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):	N/A	N/A
Strategy(s): 1.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	N/A	N/A
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
--	-----	-----

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	N/A	N/A
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <div style="text-align: right;"> White: Black: Hispanic: </div>	N/A	N/A

English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	N/A	N/A
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. White: Black: Hispanic:	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
-------------------------	---	--

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	N/A	N/A

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:	N/A	N/A

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:	N/A	N/A

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
---	----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:	N/A	N/A	N/A
---	-----	-----	-----

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:	N/A	N/A	N/A

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:	N/A	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Cambridge Elementary Magnet School welcomes pre-service teachers from both Brevard Community College and the University of Central Florida.	Administration	May 2013
2. Our teachers allow the education majors to observe them in the classroom and welcome them as tutors in the America Reads, Brevard Deeds, and BCC Buddies Program	Administration, Teachers, SACC Coordinator	May 2013
3. Each new teacher hired at Cambridge receives a CET mentor teacher and is assisted by our Mentor Council Representative, National Board Certified Teachers, our Reading Coach, our Title I Coordinator, as well as writing, science, and math contact members.	Administration, Title 1 Teachers, Teacher Mentors	May 2013
4. Our Alternative Certification teachers have a district mentor, as well as a school site mentor to assist with their transition into the field of education.	Administration, Teacher Mentors	May 2013
5. BEST practices and Instructional Performance Appraisal System Observation criteria will be used to create a system for continuous improvement of instruction and supervision based on a common vision of effective teaching.	Administration	May 2013
6. Our goal is to have 80% of the teaching staff hold a master's degree or higher or National Board Certification by 2020.	Administration, Teachers	May 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
--	--

<p>16% (8) are currently out of field for ESOL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Robin Cook ● Kristen Gibson ● Erik Jacobson ● Laurie McGonagle ● Cybelle Rodriguez ● Sarah Thomasson ● Monique Vargas ● Roaxanne Woerner 	<p>All teachers are currently completing professional development ESOL course work being offered through the District</p>
--	---

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

<p>MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)</p> <p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <p>Administration: Hilah Mercer (Principal) and Kori Hurst (Assistant Principal) Title I Staff: Mary Anne Pittman (Literacy Coach), Karen Tabor (Writing/Primary Math), Terrie Back (Title I Math) Guidance: Sarah Brothers</p> <p>To organize and coordinate MTSS efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Each grade level has a designated MTSS contact teacher who assists the team in completing the MTSS forms and processes. ● Grade level data teams meet weekly during planning and at least two members of the RtI Leadership team are present for planning and assistance purposes. Teams use a problem solving model that determines root causes to academic and behavioral concerns. Based on level of concern for student, or point in the process, teachers bring specific A3 data. Teacher discusses 1-2 students of concern per meeting. Begin with students in lowest 10% and work to include the lowest 25%. Scientifically based programs and resources intended to improve students' academics or behaviors are organized into three tiers. Interventions are selected as indicated by student need. ● Collaborate using MTSS problem solving model and data sheets. Teachers fill out Academic/Behavioral concern with extenuating circumstances and documentation of parent contact. ● Teachers complete MTSS Forms 1, 2 and 3A before presenting students of concern during grade level biweekly Tier 2 and 3 MTSS meetings. ● During Tier 2 and 3 MTSS meetings background information/baseline data is presented. Clear,
--

objective, measurable goals for student progress are set. Goal gap and the correct scientifically research based intervention strategy(s) is determined.

- Tier 2 and 3 students are placed on a calendar for every 4-6 weeks after the initial conference (updated data). MTSS forms 1-5 must be completed prior to referral to IPST.
- Response to interventions will be documented on A3 data point sheets.
- Movement between tiers with adjustments to the intensity of interventions will be based on monitored data point progress. Instructional consultation will precede movement from Tier 2 to Tier 3.

RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP:

- The School Advisory Council, led by the school administration, with the MTSS Leadership Team will develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Moving all students to competency in core academic areas and closing the achievement gap between AYP subgroups will be a primary focus of the SIP. Year 3 RtI Implementation will focus on reading and math.
- The Reading Coach will be responsible for advising, monitoring and modeling additional strategies and reviewing materials for all grade level interventions. This coach will also provide modeling of instruction for intervention groups.
- The 3-6 Math Coach will model instructional strategies for teaching the NGSSS Math Curriculum to classroom teachers to include CCSS practices. A Title 1 primary math teacher will monitor and assist kinds in implementing CCSS content and practices.. She will also provide training faculty wide and by grade levels.
- The Writing Coach will monitor writing samples from each grade level K-6. She will ensure the grade level specific school-wide writing plan is implemented. She will model and assist with writing instruction in the classrooms with an increased emphasis on writing conventions.
- The Science Leadership Team will responsible for advising, monitoring and modeling strategies and reviewing materials for science instruction for all grade levels. Resources will be provided to classroom teachers in implementing the NGSSS Science Curriculum. Our Science Lab will be utilized by our Title 1 science teacher as part of the activity wheel for grades 2-6.
- The Guidance Counselor will perform classroom observations on students of concern and serve as the coordinator of the bi-weekly MTSS Grade Level/Data Team meetings.

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will continue to be implemented school-wide. PBS Tier 2 interventions will also be implemented. The S.H.E.I.L.D. Activity Wheel Teachers will serve as Tier 2 implementers for grades 2-6. Our Guidance Counselor will be the Tier 2 coach for grades K-1.

The data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data:

- **Data Sources**
 - District Required Assessments (DRAs) based on the district adopted content area curriculum programs for reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. (Tier 1,2,3)
 - Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR) (Tier 1,2,3)
 - Pearson SuccessMaker Computer Assisted Instruction (Tier 1,2,3)

- Phonological Awareness Screener for Intervention (PASI) (Tier 2,3)
- Phonics Screener for Intervention (PSI) (Tier 2,3)
- Rewards-Multisyllabic Word Study (Tier 2,3)
- Voyager (Tier 3)

- **Data Management Systems**

- A3 Vision
- AS400
- Desktop Student Data System
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

Our plan to train staff on Rtl.

- August 08-May 23 teachers, Rtl Leadership Team, to include administration and Individual Problem Solving Team (IPST), will continue to meet weekly to focus on compliance with Tier 1, 2, and 3 Rtl mandates and best practices. Grade level designee teachers will serve as Rtl facilitators for the teachers on their team.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

In additional to our regularly scheduled Title 1 nights Cambridge parents, students and teachers will participate in dinner and data nights. Students will set goals, track and discuss individualized data with their parents. For the first time at Cambridge English language classes are being provided through a partnership with Adult Ed and Title 1 to support non-English speaking parents with their acquisition of English. Cambridge will enhance parent involvement focused on student achievement through the increase use of Edline. Teachers in grades 3-6 will post grades weekly in core academic areas for parent review and follow-up with their students. This will in turn increase student achievement. Cambridge’s Parent Involvement Plan at <https://app1.fl DOE.org/bsa/parentInvolvementPlan/>

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

Cambridge had an overall attendance rate of 95.50% at the end of the 2011-2012 school year. As a result of our increased attendance rate we will continue to utilize Synervoice (automated phone call home) system to inform guardians of daily student absences and tardies. Distribute letters for students with excessive absences and tardies on a quarterly basis.

2012 Current Attendance Rate	2013 Expected Attendance Rate
95.50%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
71	60
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
165	145

SUSPENSION:

Cambridge differentiates Tier 2 through Positive Behavior Support: Response to Intervention for Behavior by use of the S.H.I.E.L.D. team Form behavior interventions based on areas of concern for Tier 2 students and track discipline data accordingly.

2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
53	45
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
41	30
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
94	75
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
47	30

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

N/A

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)

N/A