Charlotte County Public Schools

Vineland Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Vineland Elementary School

467 BOUNDARY BLVD, Rotonda West, FL 33947

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/ves

Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Bachnik

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2019-20 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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Vineland Elementary School

467 BOUNDARY BLVD, Rotonda West, FL 33947

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/ves

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	13%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Vineland, Where Herons SOAR:
Show Respect
Own Actions
Accept Differences
Realize Potential

Provide the school's vision statement.

Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hudzina, Danielle	Principal	Oversees all functions and processes of the school, guides instructional improvement and academic achievement of the students, inspires teachers to use innovative, research bases strategies, completes evaluations, manages school budgets, ensures district, state, and Title I requirements are met, and reports to superintendent on overall academic progress of the school. Mentors L25 students weekly and ensures school morale is positive.
Bachnik, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Reports to principal. Handles evaluations, discipline of students, analyzes data and acts as an instructional leader, guiding staff to adjust instruction as needed. Organizes and up-keeps safety cabinet and drills and bullying information. Mentors L25 students and organizes school wide events and assemblies.
Dickerson, Gina	Instructional Media	Team leader for special area. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Creates special area rotations and ensures teachers are correlating their instruction to the grade level curriculum. Focuses on integrating ELA and Media standards into special area lessons.
Prummell, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for kindergarten. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for Kinder students, including DRA achievement. Tara also helps school morale by hosting social committee activities throughout the campus.
Trullinger, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Lead teacher for Vineland. Mentors new teachers, coaches teachers, organizes and hosts professional development, models lessons, organizes and models intervention materials, helps with parent involvement activities and night time events, attends SAC/PTO meetings, and other duties as listed.
Toure, Molly	School Counselor	Leads MTSS and mentoring programs. Serves on mental health team. Mentors students. Work with administration, school psychologist, and the social worker to meet the needs of all students. Molly ensures students receive integral interventions to support student needs and increase achievement. Reports to principal.
Carter, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	Team leader for ESE dept. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Also serves on PPC. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for K-5 ESE students. Sarah also works with administration to ensure ESE students are

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		included in all daily activities in the school and incorporates BPIE goals into the school.
Davel, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 4th grade. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Writing achievement for 4th grade students. Writing instruction is enhanced in 4th grade.
Hupp, Jamie	Other	ESE Liaison. Collaborates with teachers, students, families, and administration to ensure the needs of ESE students are met and IEP's are implemented with fidelity. Facilitates IEP meetings, analyzes data, and attends core team meetings. Represents ESE on a variety of topics.
Sullivan, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 2nd grade. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for second grade students, including DRA achievement.
Southwell, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 1st grade. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for first grade students, including DRA achievement. ELA is a major focus in 1st grade
Meadows, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 5th grade. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for 5th grade students. Writing and Science instruction is enhanced in 5th grade.
McCoy, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 3rd grade. Teaches and analyzes standards and adjusts instruction as needed. Gathers input from grade level team and shares this with admin at monthly leader team meetings. Supports staff in increasing ELA, Math, and Science achievement for third grade students, including DRA achievement. ELA is a major focus in 3rd grade due to mandatory (FSA level 1) ELA retention.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/11/2020, Jacqueline Bachnik

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2019-20 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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	58	86	85	73	88	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	11	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/21/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	104	87	102	87	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	9	5	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	100	104	87	102	87	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	9	5	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	57%	62%	57%	66%	60%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	70%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	60%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	63%	63%	71%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	35%	54%	62%	57%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	42%	51%	38%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%	79%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	69%	-11%	58%	0%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	51%	56%	-5%	56%	-5%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	70%	3%	62%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	69%	9%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	35%	56%	-21%	60%	-25%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
	2018	71%	63%	8%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	29	47	50	34	34	30	29				
ELL	55	67		55	38						
HSP	55	69		52	35						
WHT	57	51	50	58	34	28	57				
FRL	53	55	63	50	32	21	39				

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	37	41	26	44	41	28	55				
ELL	36	36		64	55						
HSP	55	55		77	50		79				
WHT	61	55	44	67	48	35	71				
FRL	48	45	38	60	52	37	65				

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	32	48	42	42	34	21	47				

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
ELL	50	80		79	70						
ASN	60			70							
HSP	71	78		75	72						
WHT	65	69	60	70	55	31	78				
FRL	50	60	53	58	48	38	67				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

2018-2019 data: Math lowest quartile gains showed the lowest performance, with only 26% of students achieving gains. This is a grade of an F. The previous year math lowest quartile gains were 33%, which is a grade of a D. This demonstrates a decrease from the previous year, which is trending downwards. One of the factors that contributed to decline in math was a lack of math materials, lack of knowledge on standards, and a lack of time designated for math intervention throughout the daily schedule.

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

2018-2019 data: The greatest decline was in science. In 17-18 student achievement was at 74%, which is a grade of an A. This year student achievement was 53%, which is a C grade. For the past 10 years we had a veteran science teacher who was extremely successful. In 18-19 we had a new science teacher who was unfamiliar with the science standards. In addition, Science blocks were not (a minimum) of 30 minutes or monitored regularly through walk-throughs or data chats.
This upcoming year, 20-21, we will have two new science teachers in 5th grade as well. Students will be split into two groups, so the teachers will plan Science lessons together. They will also coordinate with the STEM teacher. Science will also be discussed in Collaborative planning meetings.

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.

2018-2019 data: The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the lowest 25th percentile in math. The school achievement was 26% and the state achievement was 47%. One of the factors that contributed to this gap was the lack of math materials and the time throughout the day not specifically designated to filling in the math gaps of the L25 students.
The Ready Classroom Math curriculum, along with the Charlotte County Critical Concepts, will be followed to increase student achievement. Do the Math (intervention program) will also be utilized to increase scores.

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

2018-2019 data:The area that showed the most improvement was ELA lowest 25% gains. Students scores were at 40% in 17-18, which was a grade of a D. In 18-19, students scored 51% which is a grade of a C. The increase in this score is contributed to the implementation of 30 minutes designated to WIN time, "What I Need" time, which was focused specifically on ELA and filling in student gaps. For 20-21, Math WIN time/iii time will be included in the schedule K-5. Special area teachers will push into the Math WIN/iii block to allow more 1-1 and small group interventions to occur. The SIPPS intervention will be utilized during this time as well.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

2018-2019 data: Based on the EWS data there are three glaring areas of concern:
1. 18 students in 3rd grade failed either ELA and/or Math (current 5th graders).
2. 30 students in 5th grade scored a level 1. Was this as result of instructional strategies in 5th grade? We have a whole new team in 5th grade and these students are now gone. We need to watch STAR progress monitoring closely.

3. 16 students in 1st grade had average daily attendance that was less than 90% (current 3rd graders), and 44 students overall had an attendance average of less than 90%.

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

1. Increase learning gains in Math and Increase learning gains in Math for L25 students.
2. Increase overall achievement in Science.
3. Increase overall achievement of students with disabilities SWD (TS&I).
4. Increase overall ELA proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Math achievement (18-19 data) was low in all areas- proficiency (56%), learning gains (35%), and learning gains of L25 (26%). In addition, Math achievement (18-19) for SWD was 34%, which placed us in the TS&I category. We know Math is a critical area of concern, with our two biggest areas of decline being in Math. Until we raise L25 Math learning gains and overall Math learning gains, our Math proficiency will remain low.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase Math proficiency from 56% to 67% (A) and Math LG from 35% to a 47% (C). Progress will be monitored through STAR progress monitoring and teacher data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ready Classroom Math curriculum will be used with fidelity, including a proper scope/ sequence. The Charlotte Schools Critical Concepts Map will be followed in grades 3-5. Ready Classroom Math is ESSA approved, citing research on using the blended core curriculum and individualized curriculum to improve achievement. For students with comparable starting points, the mean mathematics achievement for the Ready Mathematics blended Core Curriculum group was statistically significantly higher in all Grades K–5 (https://www.curriculumassociates.com/-/media/mainsite/files/i-ready/research-overview-proven-to-work-brochure-2019.pdf). Collaborative planning will be used to ensure teachers understand all standards. "Do the Math" will be used during WIN (What I Need) time to fill student gaps. The program cites research on the use of manipulatives, learning goals, feedback, etc to effectively fill gaps (https://www.hmhco.com/programs/do-the-math/research-results). A separate Math WIN block has been scheduled for K-5. Special area teachers will push in during this block so more 1-1/small group interventions can be used (Tier 2 & 3).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ready Classroom Math meets the "moderate" rating for ESSA and has years of data to support higher achievement scores (https://www.curriculumassociates.com/-/media/mainsite/files/i-ready/research-overview-proven-to-work-brochure-2019.pdf). All teachers/ students K-5 have Ready Classroom Math materials. Do the Math is based on 50 years of research and meets the "moderate" rating for ESSA in grades 1-5 (https://www.hmhco.com/research/essa/essa-solutions-comparison-chart). Special area teachers will push in during the WIN block so more 1-1 and small group interventions can be used (Tier 2 and Tier 3). These small targeted groups (.77 effect size) allow for more feedback (.70 effect size) as well (https://visible-learning.org/hattie-ranking-influences-effect-sizes-learning-achievement/).

Action Steps to Implement

Review STAR data with grade level chairs/Core team and compare to 18-19 FSA data (5th grade only). FSA data will be used to distinguish patterns of improvement or decline. Cite areas of concern/need and areas of improvement according to the data. Share with all staff.

Person Responsible	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Create WIN "What I Need" Math intervention groups and create a schedule for interventions. Begin interventions with Standards Based Activities until Do the Math is available to teachers.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Bachnik (jacqueline.bachnik@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monitor the use of Do the Math and other STB activities for Math WIN time by completing weekly walk-throughs all year.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Bachnik (jacqueline.bachnik@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Review STAR data after each progress monitoring assessment and adjust student intervention groups as needed. This will be completed through grade level chair meetings and 1-1 teacher data chats. Repeat each quarter and continue to adjust practices as needed.

Person Responsible	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Science data (FSA) declined 20% to 51% achievement in 2018-2019. This is a critical area of need as this was the third biggest data decline for VES. A (minimum) 30 minute Science block is included in the master schedule K-4, with 5th grade receiving 40 minutes of instructional time. Students will now be guaranteed Science instruction daily, with administration completing walk-throughs to ensure this is occuring. Teachers will utilize the Science Elevate Curriculum, including the online component, and Freckle Science, to instruct students in Science based topics. In addition, the STEM teacher will see each class once a week and emphasize important Science concepts/Big Ideas. Admin/The News Crew will focus on NGSS Science vocabulary every Wednesday on the Student News.
Measurable Outcome:	We will raise Science achievement up 9% from a 51% to a 62% (A).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Pearson Elevate Science curriculum will be utilized K-5 and is correlated to the NGSS Science Standards. Each child will receive a minimum of 30 minutes daily Science Instruction utilizing evidence based strategies, such as inquiry based learning. The STEM teacher will reinforce concepts in the K-5 curriculum once a week during special area time. Teachers will utilize interactive Science word walls (grades 2-5) and journals (kindergarten & 1st).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Pearson Elevate includes evidence based instruction (inquiry based) and utilizes evidence-based assessments at the end of each topic. These assessments present a scenario-based, multi-component task. The task will not only simultaneously assess multiple practices, but also measure a student's conceptual understanding of the science ideas (https://assets.savvas.com/asset_mgr/current/202034/Elevate-Science-K5-Overview.pdf?_ga=2.33895332.421088190.1600023069-1865660246.1600023069). Interactive word walls are an effective teaching strategy (Jackson and Ash 2011; Jackson, Tripp, and Cox 2011).They support the development of scientific thinking; build academic vocabulary; and reinforce important patterns while providing an overview of each lesson (http://www.thesciencetoolkit.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Interactive-Word-Walls-Science-and-Children.pdf).

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with grade level chairs to discuss implementing word walls and to review the curriculum maps (5th grade critical concepts) for Science K-5. We will review the Pearson Elevate Program highlights at this time as well.

Person Responsible Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Send instructional materials/information regarding word walls and Pearson Science Elevate. Allow teachers 2 weeks to implement an interactive word wall.

Person Responsible Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Complete walk-throughs weekly to ensure Science is taught with fidelity using the Elevate curriculum and that word walls are posted and interactively used in classrooms (kinder will use journals).

Person Responsible	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are TS&I for Students With Disabilities (SWD), at 36%. We must raise the achievement and learning gains of SWD if we are to improve our overall school grade and remove ourselves from TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall achievement for SWD 9%, or to 45%. This will remove our TS&I status.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 18-19 testing year, co-teach ESE rooms were utilized. Now separate inclusion rooms are used so students can receive push-in services from a special education teacher in Math/ELA while also receiving support from their classroom teacher. We are implementing WIN Math/Reading blocks. We are also implementing SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Sight Words) program, QuickReads, and Do the Math during WIN/iii time. We are 1-1 mentoring our L25 students, many of whom are SWD. Additional staff (paraprofessionals/ESE teachers) are pushing into each inclusion classroom daily. The Self-contained ESE classes are utilizing small groups and also have low student to adult ratios. We received a new allocation this year that allowed for smaller class sizes. The self-contained classes have 2 grade levels together (for example, K/1) instead of 3 grade levels. This allows teachers more flexibility to really dig into the standards and do small group and 1-1.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Intervention programs (SIPPS, QuickReads, Do the Math) have a .77 effect size on student achievement. In addition, all three programs are aligned with the MTSS framework, which we use to track student progress in struggling areas (1.29 effect size). QuickReads is listed as an Instructional Intervention Tool on the National Center on Intensive Intervention at American Institute for Research (NCII) website. The program received full marks in participants, design, fidelity of implementation, and measures/targets and has a "strong" rating according to ESSA. 1-1 Mentoring of students allows for more feedback, which has a .70 effect size on student achievement. Small group instruction is utilized in the ESE inclusion rooms through the push-in model. This strategy has a .47 effect size on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Meet with special area teachers and core team to review mentoring guidelines and to pick students to mentor.	
Person Responsible	Molly Toure (molly.toure@yourcharlotteschools.net)
The counselor and administration will monitor the fidelity of mentoring through the google drive. Administration will address any areas of concern.	
Person Responsible	Molly Toure (molly.toure@yourcharlotteschools.net)

After Quarter 1, 2, and 3 progress monitoring assessments, administration/core team will hold L25 meetings to give specific feedback to the L25 students and SWD to encourage them to do their best. Strategies for improvement will be discussed during this time and students will be praised for their hard work.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Bachnik (jacqueline.bachnik@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Please see the ELA and Math goals for action steps regarding SIPPS, Do the Math, QuickReads, etc. listed in this goal as well.

Person Responsible	Kelly Trullinger (kelly.trullinger@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our goal is for all students to be on level in ELA. Our current 5th graders scored 4% lower than the previous year of 3rd graders (18-19 FSA data). We saw a decrease in overall ELA proficiency in both our 3rd and 5th graders (18-19 FSA data). Increasing overall ELA achievement will also aid in an increase in Science and Math scores, as word problem comprehension would improve as well.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA achievement from a 57% to a 60% (B). Progress will be monitored through STAR progress monitoring and teacher data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure a 90 minute uninterrupted Reading block. We are implementing a WIN (what I need) Reading block. We are also implementing small group interventions, such as the SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) Reading program, Word Heroes/Word Wisdom program, and QuickReads Intervention programs during WIN/ iii time. Scholastic materials were purchased for use and correlate to the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA's). LAF's materials and differentiated centers are used in all classrooms. All teachers will follow the CCPS curriculum guides and 3-5 will follow the Critical Concepts. Each team is collaboratively planning (with the Lead Teacher).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Word Wisdom and Word Heroes Vocabulary intervention (.62 effect size) Over 30 years of research utilizing the HERO approach: High impact words; Encounters in various contexts; Reading comprehension; Oral language instruction (https://www.zaner-bloser.com/vocabulary/word-heroes/index.php). Intervention programs (SIPPS, QuickReads) in general have a .77 effect size on student achievement. In addition, both SIPPS and QuickReads are aligned with the MTSS framework, which we use to track student progress in struggling areas (1.29 effect size). QuickReads is listed as an Instructional Intervention Tool on the National Center on Intensive Intervention at American Institute for Research (NCII) website. The program received full marks in participants, design, fidelity of implementation, and measures/targets and has a "strong" rating according to ESSA. Effect size data: (https://visible-learning.org/hattie-ranking-influences-effect-sizes-learning-achievement/)

Action Steps to Implement

Review STAR data with grade level chairs/Core team and compare to 18-19 FSA data (5th grade only). FSA data will be used to distinguish patterns of improvement or decline. Cite areas of concern/need and areas of improvement according to the data. Share with all staff.

Person Responsible	Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Create WIN "What I Need" ELA intervention groups and create a schedule for interventions. Begin interventions with Standards Based Activities until Do the Math is available to teachers.

Person Responsible Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monitor the use of WIN/iii activities for ELA WIN time by completing weekly walk-throughs all year.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Bachnik (jacqueline.bachnik@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Review STAR data after each progress monitoring assessment and adjust student intervention groups as needed. This will be completed through grade level chair meetings and 1-1 teacher data chats. Repeat each quarter and continue to adjust practices as needed.

Person Responsible Danielle Hudzina (danielle.hudzina@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will continue to monitor student attendance and encourage students to attend school every day. However, due to Covid-19, we will not encourage the attendance of students who are feeling sick or who have symptoms of Covid-19. We will also pay particular attention to the attendance codes entered into FOCUS to ensure students who are excluded due to Covid-19 are receiving work from their teachers to stay caught up. The social worker and counselor will aid in this schoolwide improvement priority.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

* Input from SAC/PTO
* PFEP Team
* Hardworking Heron (staff)
* Live School points
* Facebook
* Remind
* Quarterly Spirit Sticks
* Heron of the Month (students)

* Spirit Days/Dress up days and contests
* Input from staff via surveys and grade level chair meetings
* Climate survey
* Title I parent survey
* Student input via surveys and small group meetings
* Hand-written praise/notes of thanks for all staff

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**