
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Village Academy On The Art & Sara Jo Kobacker Campus

400 SW 12TH AVE, Delray Beach, FL 33444

<https://vac.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Latoya Dixon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Village Academy On The Art & Sara Jo Kobacker Campus

400 SW 12TH AVE, Delray Beach, FL 33444

<https://vac.palmbeachschools.org>

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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

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 Village Academy is to prepare conscious, critical thinkers that are equipped to create an equitable and sustainable world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Village Academy, we believe that our students are curious, creative, capable, and rich in potential . Our Vision is to empower students and families and prepare a generation of high level learners and college and career ready students.

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
Tyler, Pamela	Administrative Support	ELL Coordinator; Responsible for monitoring progress of ELL students and coordinating support services for ELL students including support facilitation; Coordinator of ACCESS testing.
Dixon, Latoya	Principal	To serve as the instructional leader of the school;To provide educational leadership and assume final responsibility for the administration, organization, and evaluation of curricular and extra-curricular programs; To serve as chairperson of the administrative team and of the instructional council of the school and to oversee and supervise all programs at the school ;To provide a school atmosphere conducive to effective learning and have productive social interactions;To assure the implementation of all policies, procedures and directives as established by the Superintendent and the School Board of Palm Beach Count;To establish effective communication with parents and others in the community that increases their understanding of school programs and challenges and enlists their support in helping the school better achieve its goals
Williams, Tamica	Assistant Principal	Responsible for coordinating and monitoring the implementation of secondary curriculum; behavior needs of students, professional learning communities, planning for academic initiatives and Title 1 Program Implementation.
Brant, Jacqueline	Teacher, ESE	To oversee the ESE students; grades K - 12;To monitor the progress of the ESE ESSA goals for SWD;To monitor data and complete student IEPs;to engage in data chats with ESE teachers-students;to assist with Title 1 Parent Involvement Plan and School Improvement Plan writing and implementation to ensure compliance
Civitello, Brenda	Instructional Coach	To coordinate data collection and analysis, to provide data reports as needed, and to assist with the dissemination of data in a timely manner ;To facilitate professional collaboration meetings as needed (side by side support for PLCs and common planning) ;To coordinate in-service staff development with support of the Professional Development
Matilus , Naomie	Instructional Coach	Reading support, curriculum support, teacher mentor, professional learning communities, collaboration, small group support, implementation and supervision of initiatives.
Permenter, Kisa	Assistant Principal	Responsible for coordinating and monitoring the implementation of elementary curriculum; behavior needs of students, professional learning communities, planning for academic initiatives, ESP, Title 1 co-contact, Safety and more.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Latoya Dixon

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.*

5

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	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	68	63	67	47	64	44	64	66	55	39	21	16	12	626
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	27	15	21	1	8	2	2	1	0	0	2	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	2	6	2	4	13	16	14	2	1	10	75
Course failure in ELA	0	13	35	11	36	13	40	10	4	2	5	0	10	179
Course failure in Math	0	8	13	7	28	19	39	16	12	16	2	1	1	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	21	23	15	15	7	3	11	115
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	26	18	25	17	5	0	11	121
FY20 ELA Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	43	23	46	35	36	25	13	4	0	0	225
FY20 Math Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	40	23	28	40	23	25	0	0	0	0	179

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	9	22	9	34	18	37	24	22	21	6	1	12	215

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	76	51	60	55	44	56	59	52	46	22	42	30	14	607
Attendance below 90 percent	8	3	3	4	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	33
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	2	6	18	15	8	4	8	2	1	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	12	25	22	29	37	8	7	6	9	9	6	0	186
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	14	36	29	25	17	7	21	10	5	189

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	2	1	5	19	15	31	15	13	7	8	12	7	0	135

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	12	7	14	10	9	12	5	10	6	3	88
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	76	51	60	55	44	56	59	52	46	22	42	30	14	607
Attendance below 90 percent	8	3	3	4	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	33
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	2	6	18	15	8	4	8	2	1	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	12	25	22	29	37	8	7	6	9	9	6	0	186
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	14	36	29	25	17	7	21	10	5	189

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	2	1	5	19	15	31	15	13	7	8	12	7	0	135

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	12	7	14	10	9	12	5	10	6	3	88
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	36%	56%	61%	35%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	58%	59%	50%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	55%	54%	41%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	35%	53%	62%	35%	43%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%	55%	59%	51%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	52%	48%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	26%	45%	56%	28%	41%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	75%	78%	52%	67%	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	9	10	11	12		
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	22%	54%	-32%	58%	-36%
	2018	14%	56%	-42%	57%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	62%	-19%	58%	-15%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				
05	2019	34%	59%	-25%	56%	-22%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
06	2019	28%	58%	-30%	54%	-26%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	36%	53%	-17%	52%	-16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	52%	56%	-4%	55%	-3%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
10	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	65%	-28%	62%	-25%
	2018	27%	63%	-36%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	67%	-12%	64%	-9%
	2018	27%	63%	-36%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				
05	2019	29%	65%	-36%	60%	-31%
	2018	44%	66%	-22%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	18%	60%	-42%	55%	-37%
	2018	33%	56%	-23%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
07	2019	8%	35%	-27%	54%	-46%
	2018	29%	39%	-10%	54%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
08	2019	45%	64%	-19%	46%	-1%
	2018	33%	65%	-32%	45%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	51%	-30%	53%	-32%
	2018	19%	56%	-37%	55%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	33%	51%	-18%	48%	-15%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	26%	69%	-43%	67%	-41%
2018	49%	67%	-18%	65%	-16%
Compare		-23%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	72%	-27%	71%	-26%
2018	50%	72%	-22%	71%	-21%
Compare		-5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	69%	6%	70%	5%
2018	27%	68%	-41%	68%	-41%
Compare		48%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	64%	-4%	61%	-1%
2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	26%	60%	-34%	57%	-31%
2018	18%	57%	-39%	56%	-38%
Compare		8%			

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	2	33	36	15	50	45	6	17			
ELL	31	39	38	37	55	46	24	20			
BLK	37	45	48	33	50	50	27	57	96	100	36
HSP	35	52		51	71		26	63			
FRL	36	46	45	35	51	49	26	61	96	100	26
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	9	38	41	14	27	20	6	8			
ELL	31	51	40	29	41	38	5	41			
BLK	40	55	49	34	44	33	32	47	100	100	35
HSP	37	46	23	40	49	45	48				
FRL	39	54	47	34	44	34	34	44	100	100	38
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	3	28	28	11	35	33	4				
ELL	24	49	56	27	47	50	9				
BLK	35	51	42	35	52	51	24	50	41	100	29
HSP	45	55	43	40	44	17	48	70			
FRL	35	50	41	35	51	49	28	53	44	97	29

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	616
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is middle school math- 6th grade math students demonstrated 17% proficiency and 7th grade students demonstrated a 7% proficiency rate and very little learning gains. Teachers will have the additional support of the ELL resource teacher pushing into regular classes, who has a math background as well. The ELA performance for 3rd grade WDIAG was low with 28% proficiency. About 50% of 3rd grade students were ESE & ELL students. Additionally according to iReady Diagnostics and RRR, equally about 40% of FY 20 3rd grade students were performing 1-2 levels below grade level. The teachers will be required to attend bi-weekly PLC's, meet with District support and implement the District Aligned assessments provided by the District in the Performance Matters System.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is middle school math- 6th grade math students demonstrated 17% proficiency and 7th grade students demonstrated a 7% proficiency rate and very little learning gains. The other area that showed the greatest decline was Biology, dropping 20% from 46% to 26%. The student decline in math is partially due to the change in complexity of standards as they shift from elementary to middle school. The 6th graders are weak in foundational math skills and also struggle with comprehension with math literacy. Thirty-six percent of the 6th graders from the FY 20 cohort are ESE.

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.

There is a significant gap when compared to the state average for Village's ELA scores. The scoring is 36% compared to the state at 61%. This equals 25% deficiency for ELA. In math Village scored 35% compared to the state at 62%. This equals a 2% deficiency. However, the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is science. The state average was 56% and Village Average was 26% resulting in a 30% deficit. Village Academy has 3 areas of science that contribute to this score, 5th, 8th & Biology. The Biology scores declined drastically and decreased the average for science. We also had many students who were originally predicted to be proficient for 8th

grade based on the Diagnostic not meet that prediction and score in the range of a high level 2, which was an unexpected decline. All science teachers will implement the regular use of District Aligned Assessments which will be closely monitored by the Assistant Principals and Single School Culture Coordinator during PLC's and through lesson planning.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Social Studies. The 11th grade U.S. History scores improved from 26% up to 75%. The cohort of students were involved in dual enrollment, Take Stock in Children and many other enriching activities. The teacher also began implementing more technology in lesson delivery after becoming a Trailblazer. This improvement raised our overall social studies performance (averaged with Civics) which contributed significantly to maintaining our points earned as a "C". Additionally our growth in acceleration for middle school contributed to an increase in our points for school grade. The FY 20 4th grade cohort showed strength with a 49% Winter DIAG score. Daily common planning for teachers where teachers unpacked standards, backward design lessons from assessments, used standard based question stems . Students practiced these questions with read-alouds, in small groups and shared reading.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, students having less than 90% attendance is the highest in 2nd grade with 27/67. Regarding course failures in ELA, there were 40/64 6th students; 36/64 4th grade students and 35/67 2nd grade students. Regarding the number of level 1 students the data from 8th grade math shows 25/51 students earning a level 1 and in 6th grade 26/64 students earning a level 1. This data shows a pattern of low performance as students move up from elementary to middle to high. Maintaining proficiency and continued improvement across the school continuum continues to be a challenge .

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

Village Academy's Leadership Team has identified the five highest priority areas for school wide improvement for the upcoming school year. The first priority is 3rd grade reading proficiency. Village students in K-2 show deficits in their early assessments in Reading Running Records. This systemic problem makes the LTO #1 of increasing 3rd grade reading number one on the list of our top five priorities. The second priority for school wide improvement in the upcoming school year is to increase proficiency in middle school math. The school wide average for math proficiency is 35% and the number declines further with middle school math. Middle school math- 6th grade math students demonstrated 17% proficiency and 7th grade students demonstrated a 7% proficiency rate and very little learning gains. This area is in alignment with LTO #2 ensuring high school readiness. By preparing 6th and 7th graders for Algebra 1 we will increase high school readiness and create opportunities for advanced coursework in mathematics. The third priority for school wide improvement for the upcoming school year is science proficiency. The state average was 56% and Village Average was 26% resulting in a 30% deficit. Village Academy has 3 areas of science that contribute to this score, 5th, 8th & Biology. The Biology scores declined drastically and decreased the average for science. Twenty-two of the 99 students (22%) that took a Science WDIAG were proficient. However, 8/21 or 38% of Biology students demonstrated proficiency with 7/21 or 33% scoring a level 2. This is higher than the school wide average and by creating academic supports, level 2 Bio students can reach proficiency. Actions to focus on 5th grade proficiency in science especially will be a priority. The fourth highest priority identified for school wide improvement this upcoming school year is the area of College and Career Readiness. With only 2 AP courses being offered in FY 20 and our students having mobility challenges (dual enrollment) our College and Career Readiness components need some strengthening. The fifth and last priority for the upcoming school year is to increase our ESSA

subgroups by 10% as compared with FY 19 data- SWD from 27% to 37% and ELL from 37% to 47%. The action steps that will be put forth in Reading and Math and specifically on the part of the ESE/ELL school leaders will address the low performance and make learning gains and growth in proficiency an important priority.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELL-ESSA Grade 37% to increase 10% to 47% and ESE ESSA Grade 27% to 37% in alignment to LTO #3, High school graduation. Our ELL population has the second lowest achievement in Math and ELA. Historically, this subgroup has the second lowest performance in achievement throughout several years. The (average all 3 levels) gap of proficiency with our ELL students was 31% as compared to the ESSA minimum proficiency of 41%. Village Academy ELL students need to increase by 10% to meet our Strategic Plan goals. Regarding the more recent Winter Diagnostic scores, 14 % of ELL students were proficient in ELA and 8% of ESE students were proficient showing a decline of 23% in ELA (ELL) and 19% (ESE) respectively, when compared to the State ESSA score. Regarding ESE (ELA), 30/85 (35%) students that tested on the WDIAG scored in the level 2 range and 46/85 (54%) scored a level 1. When looking at the Math WDIAG, 30% of our ELL students (grades 3-10) were proficient and 14% of our ESE students were proficient. Of our 90 ELL students that tested, 27 (30%) were a level 2 and for ESE, 25/77 or 32% were a level 2.

Measurable Outcome:

Our measurable goals for FY 20 will be to have a 10% increase in our (ESSA score) ELL subgroup in both ELA and Math. This would be an increase from 35% to 45% in ELA and similarly from 35% in Math to 45% in Math. In Algebra 1 our goal is to increase by 5% from 60% to 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latoya Dixon (latoya.dixon@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students will be remediated and enriched through digital and blended learning opportunities using adaptive technology; Achieve 3000, enVision Math, Math Nation, and Imagine Learning to build content knowledge across content areas. ESE & ELL coordinators will lead the monitoring of students on aligned assessments and usage reports from Imagine Learning and Achieve 3000.
2. ELA, ELL, and Math teachers will engage in standards based instruction cycle during collaborative planning. (1) What do students need to know and understand? (2) How do we teach effectively to ensure all students are learning (3) How do we know the students are learning? (4) What do we do when students are not learning or reaching mastery before expected? (5) Teachers will analyze standards and test Item Specifications during the process.
3. Differentiated small group instruction within all ELA and Math Classrooms through our "double down" strategy from our ELL & ESE support facilitators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Achieve 3000 offers a success rate of 3.5X evidence growth rate. Lessons are uniquely designed to meet the needs of classrooms with a diverse mix of student abilities and needs: with engaging nonfiction content scaffolds, and linguistic supports for struggling readers and ELL learners, Pro accelerates learning gains and empowers all students. Algebra Nation offer a significant increase in satisfactory scores at the end of the year and state assessments.
2. Standards based teaching/learning cycle ensures better accountability- holding teachers and schools responsible for what goes on in the classrooms. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps ensure that a higher level of learning is attained.
3. Differentiated small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused on what the students need to learn. Evidence has demonstrated that ongoing observation of students and systematic assessment enables teachers to support and enhance student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Adaptive technology will be offered within all ELA/ELL and Math classrooms with the use of Chromebooks. All students will be expected to utilize the programs a minimum of 60 min per week- ELA and 45/ week for math.

Person Responsible Latoya Dixon (latoya.dixon@palmbeachschools.org)

2. PLC's to review standards, analyze data, determine next steps with the instruction of standards and revise as necessary.

Person Responsible Brenda Civitello (brenda.civitello@palmbeachschools.org)

3. Teachers will be provided PD (with virtual options) and/or mentoring to ensure small group instruction is taking place. Resource teachers will push into the ELA and math classrooms to facilitate successful differentiated small groups. Teachers will collaboratively practice differentiation in the classroom by:

- Designing lessons based on students' learning styles.
- Grouping students by shared interests, topic, or their ability for assignments.
- Assessing students' learning using formative assessments.
- Managing the classroom to create a safe and supportive environment.
- Continually assessing, reflecting and adjusting lesson content to meet students' needs.

Person Responsible Kisa Permenter (kisa.harley-permenter@palmbeachschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Village Academy students have historically remained at a 35% proficiency in reading. This pattern and slow movement across sub-levels (FSA scores) continually requires that students receive ongoing support in reading through elementary middle and high school. This area is a critical need for our students and impacts their opportunities to take accelerated course work, dual enroll and even graduate. This ELA deficiency begins early in Pre-K with about roughly 75% of PK students rolling into our Kindergarten program. Regarding the goals for our data, an ELA- increase from 35% to 45% school-wide is our target and in alignment to LTO 2, high school readiness and LTO 3, high school graduation rate.

Measurable Outcome: Our measurable outcome for the FY20 school year is to reach a school-wide proficiency in ELA (3-10) of 45% which is an increase of 10%. The ELA growth school-wide has been slow as the FY19 performance was also 35%. Specifically, the grade levels that are lagging are 3rd grade at 22% and 6th grade at 28%. Other grades that showed decline are 4th grade down from 50% to 43%, 7th grade down from 41% to 36%, and 10th grade down from 50% to 37%. Our grade-level goals are as follows:

- 3rd from 22% to 27%
- 4th from 43% to 48%
- 5th from 34% to 39%
- 6th from 28% to 33%
- 7th from 36% to 41%
- 8th from 50% to 55%
- 9th from 52% to 57%
- 10th from 37% to 42%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Latoya Dixon (latoya.dixon@palmbeachschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students will be re-mediated and enriched through digital and blended learning opportunities using adaptive technology; iReady, Reading Plus, Imagine Learning & Achieve 3000 to build content knowledge across content areas.
2. ELA teachers will implement a focused curriculum utilizing PBC ELA curriculum outlined in Scope and Sequences, units of study
3. ELA, ELL, and Math teachers will engage in standards based instruction cycle during the collaborative planning time. (1) What do students need to know and understand? (2) How do we teach effectively to ensure all students are learning (3) How do we know the students are learning? (4) What do we do when students are not learning or reaching mastery before expected? (5) Teachers will analyze standards and test Item Specifications during the process.
4. Differentiated small group instruction within all ELA Classrooms through our "double down" strategy from our ELL & ESE support facilitators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Achieve 3000 offers a success rate of 3.5X evidenced growth rate. Adaptive technology in use have been selected to build learning and are uniquely designed to meet the needs of classrooms with a diverse mix of student abilities and needs.
2. Reading Plus, iReady and Imagine Learning offer a significant increase in satisfactory scores at the end of the year based on the end of year assessments and growth goals.
3. Standards based teaching/learning cycle ensures better accountability- holding teachers and schools responsible. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps ensure that a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment and helps keep them on track.

4. Differentiated small group instruction is focused precisely on what the students need. Evidence has demonstrated that ongoing observation of students and systematic assessment enables teachers to support and enhance student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Students will be immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards & the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture & appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. Policy 209.

Person Responsible Latoya Dixon (latoya.dixon@palmbeachschools.org)

2) Adaptive technology will be offered within all ELA classrooms with the use of Chromebooks. All students will be expected to utilize the programs a minimum of 75 minutes per week for ELA (iReady, Reading Plus, Imagine Learning).

Person Responsible Brenda Civitello (brenda.civitello@palmbeachschools.org)

3) Teachers will meet on a consistent rotation during PLC's to review standards, analyze data demonstrating standards mastery, determine next steps with the instruction of standards and revise as necessary. Vertical planning and instructional round tables will take place to identify instructional gaps and loss of learning . Expected expected outcomes by grade level will be clearly identified and lesson plans will reflect instructional practices that will support, remediate, and enrichment student continuous improvement.

Person Responsible Naomie Matilus (naomie.matilus@palmbeachschools.org)

4) Teachers will be provided PD and/or mentoring to ensure small group instruction is taking place within their classrooms. Resource teachers will push into the ELA classrooms to facilitate the execution of successful differentiated small groups. Teachers will collaboratively practice differentiation in the classroom by:

- Standards based lessons
- Assessing students' learning using formative assessments.
- Continually assessing, reflecting and adjusting lesson content to meet students' needs.

Monitoring for the above action steps will occur through classroom walks, lesson plan reviews, data analysis, and feedback.

Person Responsible Kisa Permenter (kisa.harley-permenter@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus

ELL-ESSA Grade 37% to increase 10% to 47% and ESE ESSA Grade 27% to 37% in alignment to LTO #3, High school graduation.

ELA- Increase from 35% to 45% school-wide in alignment to LTO 2, high school readiness and LTO 3, high school graduation rate.

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).

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase the academic instruction of all students- Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, Behavior, and Climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. Policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the:

- History of the Holocaust**
- History of African Americans**
- Study of the contributions of Hispanics and Women to the US, and**
- Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.**
- Declaration of Independence**
- Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights**
- Federalist papers: Republican form of government**
- Flag education**
- Civil government: functions and interrelationships**
- History of the United States**
- Principles of Agriculture**
- Effects of alcohol and narcotics**
- Kindness to animals**
- Florida history**
- Conservation of natural resources**
- Health education**
- Free enterprise**
- Character-development program**

Within our school, teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines of students practicing being responsible, respectful and ready to learn. Adults across the campus will clarify their exceptions for positive interpersonal interaction and create the structures for a Single School Culture of excellence by approaching learning through an inquiry framework while working collaboratively in groups using research-based strategies such as focused note-taking, quick writes, quick draws and learning logs to reflect on learning and track progress towards proficiency .

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.

Village Academy will engage our stakeholders in the planning process by holding a Parent and Family Engagement Input Meeting where parents and school community members can provide input/suggestions and feedback regarding the events that are planned for the school year. Suggestions and feedback provided by parents will be discussed and implemented for the upcoming school year. Any funds for Parent and Family engagement will be used in conjunction with Parent Trainings such as: STEM Night, FSA Night and Summer Slide Night. When school resumes fully face to face parent trainings will include hands on opportunities to learn programs, strategies or skills to help parents assist their children in the learning process. To adjust the support of our families additional virtual opportunities will be provided. To support SEL & family needs we have a co-located therapist, School Behavioral Health Professional, 3 guidance counselors, Family Service Facilitator in Head Start, and a Social Services Facilitator.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$585.56
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	2811 - Village Academy On The Art & Sara Jo Kobacker	School Improvement Funds	644.0	\$585.56
			<i>Notes: Decisions regarding school improvement funds will be made with SAC. Budget Justification/allocation: tutorial sessions and tutorial resources</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$585.56