
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

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

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 |