Island Village Montessori School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Island Village Montessori School

2001 PINEBROOK RD, Venice, FL 34292

www.islandvillage.org

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Ocana

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2010

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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

Island Village Montessori School

2001 PINEBROOK RD, Venice, FL 34292

www.islandvillage.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 KG-8	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	30%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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 Island Village Montessori School community is dedicated to providing all families with the gift of a Montessori education through dynamic learning experiences where children flourish in a safe learning environment that fosters independence, self-direction, excellence, creativity, and responsibility, as well as to prepare students for the 21st Century through a balance of traditional Montessori methodology with a contemporary, technology-infused curriculum, providing the world a working model of school reform that integrates academic levels from early childhood through middle school. Island Village encourages students to reach out into the community through service projects and performances. Parents are encouraged to be active participants in all aspects of their child's experience at Island Village by volunteering in the classrooms, organizing social events, and community service projects.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's School for Tomorrow's World™

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
Ocana, Jennifer	Principal	Ms Ocana, Venice campus principal, coordinates all purchases of instructional materials as well as supervises and supports staff. Promotes a positive culture of growth and wellness. Ms Ocana also serves as the Executive Director of the school.
Criswell, Megan	School Counselor	School counselor co-leads the SWST to assist teachers in identifying interventions and problem solving issues with students. The school counselor is also co-leader in charge of the mental health plan ensuring that students are receiving education and services needed to ensure appropriate mental health awareness for all students and staff. She is also the test-coordinator.
Heden, Aimee	Administrative Support	Mrs. Heden, our financial manager, works with Mrs. Ocana to manage the school's budget.
Hoffman, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Ms. Hoffman, provides leadership to staff and students in grades kindergarten through 4th grade. Ms Hoffman is also responsible for professional development and mentoring in the elementary grades.
Sessa, Jennifer	Administrative Support	ESE liaison co-leads the SWST team to assist teachers in identifying interventions and problem solving issues with students. She is the behavior specialist assisting teachers that have a need for behavior interventions for particular students in their classrooms. She is also co-leader in charge of the mental health plan ensuring that students are receiving education and services needed to ensure appropriate mental health awareness for all students and staff. She is in charge of the ESE department and ensuring that all students are properly identified, and given appropriate services and accommodations, as well as, servicing students when the case load deems necessary.
Vitiello, Michelle	Administrative Support	Mrs. Vitiello, our director of operations, works with Mrs. Ocana to manage the school's budget, human resources, and certifications/compliance issues.
Gronland, Beth	Assistant Principal	Provides academic and behavior support for grades 5-8. Ms Gronland is also the ESE liaison for the 5th-8th grades and the ESOL liaison for the entire school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/14/2010, Jennifer Ocana

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.*
10

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.*
24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	51	69	50	65	69	72	62	48	44	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	8	5	6	7	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	15	4	0	0	0	0	35

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	0	3	6	6	10	4	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/15/2020

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	77	84	77	95	83	84	57	54	41	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	12	14	11	13	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	9	20	26	7	5	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	77	84	77	95	83	84	57	54	41	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	12	14	11	13	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	9	20	26	7	5	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	66%	67%	61%	72%	69%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	60%	59%	59%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	54%	53%	58%	51%
Math Achievement	64%	70%	62%	54%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	67%	65%	59%	55%	64%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	55%	52%	50%	57%	50%
Science Achievement	59%	63%	56%	59%	58%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	88%	78%	83%	85%	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	
	(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	65%	70%	-5%	58%	7%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	67%	1%	58%	10%
	2018	59%	67%	-8%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	60%	68%	-8%	56%	4%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	66%	63%	3%	54%	12%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2019	73%	64%	9%	52%	21%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	67%	62%	5%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	65%	66%	-1%	56%	9%
	2018	84%	70%	14%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	60%	73%	-13%	62%	-2%
	2018	61%	72%	-11%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	72%	-5%	64%	3%
	2018	48%	71%	-23%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	32%	70%	-38%	60%	-28%
	2018	58%	72%	-14%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	78%	67%	11%	55%	23%
	2018	67%	66%	1%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
07	2019	71%	73%	-2%	54%	17%
	2018	28%	73%	-45%	54%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		43%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	76%	65%	11%	46%	30%
	2018	49%	63%	-14%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	53%	65%	-12%	53%	0%
	2018	75%	67%	8%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	70%	62%	8%	48%	22%
	2018	73%	62%	11%	50%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	85%	-2%	71%	12%
2018	82%	80%	2%	71%	11%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	77%	6%	70%	13%
2018	96%	76%	20%	68%	28%
Compare		-13%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	73%	19%	61%	31%
2018	89%	77%	12%	62%	27%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	52	52	36	53	50	29				
ELL	46	69		54	62						

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
HSP	56	52	59	60	63	56	53				
MUL	60	67		70	73						
WHT	68	64	63	64	67	55	61	87	95		
FRL	60	61	60	59	63	56	47	79			

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	29	40	35	31	58	55	17				
ELL	36			43							
HSP	51	54	45	54	54	64	61				
MUL	79	53		37	47						
WHT	70	64	50	62	63	57	77	85	80		
FRL	60	56	45	54	54	51	67	75	60		

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	40	50	48	28	44	41					
ELL	62	46		36	54						
HSP	54	47	41	49	51	57	32				
MUL	67	57		35	54						
WHT	75	62	59	56	56	52	64	93	88		
FRL	65	52	48	49	53	54	46				

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	68
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	676
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
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	57
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	61
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.

5th grade math was a decrease in grade-level and cohort comparison from the previous year. There were different educators. Those students now in 7th grade again have different educators with more opportunities for math intervention.

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

Other than math grade 5, science achievement showed a great decline from the previous year--75% to 59% and specifically a 22% decrease at the 5th grade level.

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 difference between school and state is the smallest in math achievement only 2% difference and also 6% lower than the district average. This is especially evident in the seventh grade math.

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

The lowest quartile in ELA had a 14% increase in achievement from 47% to 61%. There was a bigger emphasis placed on intervention and intensive instruction with this specific group of students.

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

The number of students in 7th grade that previously earned level 1 on FSA. The low percentage of achievement on the 5th grade science assessment.

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

1. Math Achievement, specifically at the 7th grade where there are many students with previous level 1

2. Science Achievement, especially at the 5th grade level.
3. Professional Development for teachers in differentiated math instruction
4. SWD courses to help teachers work with students with disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will demonstrate math achievement on the state standardized assessments. Based on the data from the 2019 FSA, overall math achievement falls below the district average of 70%, with significant number of level 1s in our current 7th grade class.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, there will be a minimum increase of math achievement from 64% to 66%, with the percentage of level 1s scored by the 7th graders reduced from 31% to 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL math program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL has individualized learning paths to help students make gains in their specific deficit areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership team will monitor implementation through weekly targeted classroom walk-thrus.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will monitor weekly direct instruction through intensive subject classes.

Person Responsible	Monica Ribbe (monicaribbe@islandvillage.org)

Teachers will assess student progress via monthly data chats with school wide support team.

Person Responsible	Megan Criswell (megancriswell@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will monitor weekly common planning time for all grade levels to review math standards.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

Intensive math instructor/ESE support services for small group intervention and remediation for identified students based on their level of proficiency. Differentiated lessons will focus on the specific needs of the student.

Person Responsible	Monica Ribbe (monicaribbe@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will provide evidenced based professional development in differentiated math instruction to all teachers to improve overall math achievement.

Person Responsible	Megan Criswell (megancriswell@islandvillage.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will demonstrate science proficiency through the State Science Assessment. Based on data, our proficiency has declined significantly in the past years.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, there will be a minimum increase in science proficiency from 59% to at least 61% proficiency in total for both grades 5 and 8, with grade 5 proficiency increasing from 53% to at least to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL and district bench-mark assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL has individualized learning paths to help students make gains in their specifc deficit areas. Bench mark assessments will allow educators to see what standards need more attention.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership team will monitor implementation through weekly targeted classroom walk-throughs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

Science teachers in grades K to 4 will use the Montessori curriculum along with direct instruction to increase science discussion and learning.

Person Responsible	Cindy Hoffman (cindyhoffman@islandvillage.org)

Science teachers in grades 5 to 8 will use iXL, targeted lessons, common unit assessments and district benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible	Monica Ribbe (monicaribbe@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will monitor weekly common planning time for all grade levels to review science standards.

Person Responsible	Cindy Hoffman (cindyhoffman@islandvillage.org)

STEM Project-based learning will be incorporated within our 5th to 8th grade classes.

Person Responsible	Monica Ribbe (monicaribbe@islandvillage.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities will demonstrate achievement on state standard assessments. Based on the data, the percentage of SWD achieveing level 3 or above on the ELA assessment is 29% compared to the school average of 66%. For mathematics, SWD have a 36% achievement compared to the school achievement average of 64%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, SWD will show increase in achievement in ELA from 29% to at least 31%, as well as an increase from 36% to at least 38% in mathematics achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL, targeted instruction with their ESE teacher
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iXL assists with gaps and deficincies using their individual learning plan. The ESE teacher also works with students on content specific strategies to increase awareness and proficincy of the SWD population.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership team will work with ESE teachers and other support staff to provide assistance and support to classroom teachers that have SWDs to provide the student the best opportunity for improcement and success.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sessa (jennifersessa@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will work with ESE teachers and other support staff to monitor implementation through weekly targeted classroom walk-thrus.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sessa (jennifersessa@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will work with ESE teachers and other support staff to monitor weekly direct instruction through intensive subject classes.

Person Responsible	Beth Gronland (bethgronland@islandvillage.org)

Classroom teachers will work with ESE teachers and other support staff assess student progress via monthly data chats with the school wide support team.

Person Responsible	Megan Criswell (megancriswell@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will monitor weekly common planning time for all grade levels to review math and ELA standards.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

Leadership team will work to provide professional development courses focused on students with diabilities.

Person Responsible	Megan Criswell (megancriswell@islandvillage.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Leadership team will work to provide professional development in areas of need including differentiated instruction, providing interventions, and working with students with disabilities. The leadership team will also provide parents with workshops to assist with home learning and advocating for their ESE child in terms of providing accommodations.

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.

To keep parents involved in the learning process and to build parent-school relationships, each learning environment keeps a classroom web page that gives the details of the current classroom and school events as well as informing the parents of curriculum and homework. The school also maintains a Facebook and Instagram account for parent interest as well as providing useful information. The community calendar on our school web site is maintained as an additional resource for families. Parents are encouraged to volunteer to help the teacher, however, this year because of concerns about COVID-19, parents due projects at home. Other forms of communication include the quarterly reports, our newly purchased Rediker software will allow parents to see current information on grades and assignments (for Elementary kindergarten-fourth grade). The School Board members review our School Improvement Plan on a regular basis and ask questions for clarification and followup.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.