

Brevard Public Schools

Viera Charter School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Viera Charter School

6206 BRESLAY DR, Viera, FL 32940

www.vieracharterschool.com

Demographics

Principal: Julie Cady

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (79%)
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

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Viera Charter School

6206 BRESLAY DR, Viera, FL 32940

www.vieracharterschool.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	28%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Viera Charter School is to provide students with a challenging program which emphasizes scientific inquiry, critical thinking, understanding of mathematical concepts and effective communication using innovative reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Viera Charter School recognizes that all children are unique; that each learns in a different style and at a different pace. We strive to meet the individual needs of every student through a variety of programs and differentiated instructional techniques designed to prepare the child for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cady, Julie	Principal	The leadership team is responsible for continuous improvement, instruction, monitoring and/or evaluation of personnel, providing feedback to all personnel, budgeting, monitoring and supervision of instructional program. Oversees the operation of the entire school.
Spadaccini, Lynn	Assistant Principal	Evaluation of staff, compliance with Student Progression, purchase/inventory/distribution of instructional materials, Parent Academies, scheduling, monitoring student academic progress
Goizueta, Chenistique	Instructional Coach	Support teachers in the area of reading and language arts: data analysis, data chats, modeling, walkthroughs, feedback
Mills, Julie	Instructional Coach	Support teachers in the area of reading and language arts: data analysis, data chats, modeling, walkthroughs, feedback
Rooney, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Discipline, Sports Activities, Evaluation

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	105	107	115	96	106	113	132	137	123	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	7	7	0	6	6	11	10	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	2	5	1	5	5	13	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	8	13	13	10	0	0	0	0	52
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	2	2	3	5	2	7	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

70

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	4	5	10	6	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	13	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	14	16	10	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	5	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	65%	61%	80%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	59%	69%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	54%	63%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	82%	67%	62%	81%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	75%	62%	59%	68%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	59%	52%	69%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	78%	62%	56%	71%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	80%	78%	94%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	105 (0)	107 (0)	115 (0)	96 (0)	106 (0)	113 (0)	132 (0)	137 (0)	123 (0)	1034 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	10 ()	7 ()	7 ()	0 ()	6 ()	6 ()	11 ()	10 ()	57 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	13 (0)	37 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	52 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	64%	9%	58%	15%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	78%	60%	18%	54%	24%
	2018	86%	63%	23%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	80%	58%	22%	52%	28%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	51%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	80%	63%	17%	56%	24%
	2018	91%	65%	26%	58%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	60%	18%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%
	2018	81%	68%	13%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
	2018	80%	62%	18%	54%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	83%	43%	40%	46%	37%
	2018	74%	41%	33%	45%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	53%	21%	48%	26%
	2018	78%	55%	23%	50%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	66%	31%	67%	30%
2018	100%	67%	33%	65%	35%
Compare		-3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	74%	19%	71%	22%
2018	90%	73%	17%	71%	19%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	60%	36%	57%	39%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-4%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	44	48	39	51	48	27				
ELL	67	69	64	67	76	62	40				
ASN	79	76		95	94						
BLK	54	55	53	59	65	61	54				
HSP	80	61	65	71	65	54	74		75		
MUL	79	67	50	79	74		100				
WHT	81	64	54	85	77	62	79	92	67		
FRL	65	56	46	67	71	58	64	81	50		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	50	48	43	31	21	18				
ELL	65	62		65	57						
ASN	82	65		91	80						
BLK	68	58	62	39	36	46	64				
HSP	72	60	44	72	56	56	75	93	67		
MUL	88	90		79	65		93		36		
WHT	85	69	56	82	59	57	84	89	66		
FRL	70	66	53	63	53	54	74	77	39		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	46	48	48	50	61	44	33				
ELL	42			42	64						
ASN	86	69		90	81						
BLK	72	55		50	71						
HSP	70	67	81	76	69	53	40	91	31		
MUL	77	72	82	85	69		87	90			
WHT	82	70	59	83	66	69	73	96	64		
FRL	77	69	63	73	64	74	64	91	40		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	654
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The areas showing the lowest performance are 3rd grade ELA and 5th grade Science. Contributing factors may be a shift in the population attending VCS. Trend data on 5th grade science indicate this area has consistently been a low performance area for VCS as well as the entire Brevard district.

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

The greatest decline occurred in 8th grade ELA, with -11% on the same-grade comparison. However, the cohort comparison shows a decline of only 2% points. Yet, the school continues to have outstanding performance with 80% of the population showing proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap is between the school and state proficiency on Algebra I. Across the state only 61% of the students were proficient, where 100% of VCS students were proficient. VCS carefully selects students for Algebra I using a rubric including the Orleans-Hanna, FSA scores and report card grades. We believe we are selecting appropriate students who are ready for the rigors of this high school course.

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

Fifth grade mathematics showed the greatest improvement with an increase of 8% in the same-grade comparison and a 1% increase in the cohort comparison. This increase is the result of implementing a new mathematics program as well as making staffing changes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two potential areas of concern are "attendance below 90%" and "Level 1 on statewide assessments". VCS will address both areas by increasing rigor and engagement in the classroom.

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

1. Increase Rigor across the curriculum to ensure all students are challenged
2. Increase engagement by incorporating the innovative instructional methods of Problem-Based Learning, Cambridge and AVID
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Rigorous standards-based instruction in all content areas
Rationale	VCS students and their discerning parents expect excellence from a choice school. While VCS has exceptional, highly-qualified teachers, walk-through data reveal that some classrooms are not offering engaging, rigorous instruction for all students. Additionally, because we have been an A school over the past six years, one of the few ways to maintain a high level of performance is to increase rigor.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Viera Charter School will improve ELA from 79% to 83%; Mathematics from 82% to 85% and Science from 78% to 82%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement WICOR across the content areas in all grades Train staff and Implement Cambridge rigorous challenges in each grade level each semester Replace project-based learning with problem-based learning in which students attempt to create solutions for real problems or concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share school-wide data with all stakeholders; analyze subgroup/ESSA data 2. Identify areas of concern to provide rationale for strategies 3. Provide professional development in WICOR (AVID) strategies and Cambridge Challenge expectations 4. Instructional coaches will support teachers with WICOR and Cambridge expectations 5. Administrators and instructional coaches will conduct walk-throughs and give feedback relative to WICOR and Cambridge expectations 6. Monitor student grades, WICOR tracking document, iReady data and intervene
Person Responsible	Julie Cady (jcady@vieracharterschool.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Teachers will be trained how to use Cambridge strategies and, therefore, will be able to provide rigorous standards-based instruction in all content areas by incorporating those strategies into their lessons. The first strategy teachers will incorporate will be implementation of Cambridge Stages. These stages provide students and teachers a clear outline of standards in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening.

Teachers will also provide students with a list of their “Success Criteria” for assignments. The success criteria will allow students the opportunity to apply what they have learned and verify that they have met all criteria’s necessary for success. Students will participate in rigorous activities where they will be challenged to think, perform, and grow through the Cambridge Challenges presented in the Global Perspectives curriculum.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Rigorous standards-based instruction in all content areas				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1530	110-Administrators	6540 - Viera Charter School	Other		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Eight Teachers attended Cambridge professional development sessions. Costs include registration fees, hotel, travel and meals.</i>			
Total:						\$5,000.00