Washington County School District

Vernon Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Vernon Elementary School

3665 ROCHE AVE, Vernon, FL 32462

http://ves.wcsdschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Steve Griffin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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)	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* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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 Washington 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

Vernon Elementary School

3665 ROCHE AVE, Vernon, FL 32462

http://ves.wcsdschools.com

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Washington 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.

Vernon Elementary School is committed to the personal and academic excellence for every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vernon Elementary School will provide students the highest quality education possible, with the resources necessary, so they can achieve their maximum potential and become knowledgeable, responsible, and competent citizens.

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
Griffin, Steve	Principal	Instructional Leader for the school, supervises teachers, data analysts, and other staff. Meets with parents and the district office staff to insure all laws and guidelines are being implemented and followed.
English, Latina	Assistant Principal	Assisting the Principal, Supervision of attendance, Innovative Learning, newsletter, website, facebook, and discipline.
Haddock, Kaye	School Counselor	Supervises the overall mental health of staff and students on campus, meets with students and staff, homeless students and programs, enrollment and withdrawal.
Bush, Debbie	Instructional Coach	Leads MTSS process, gives PD, organizes PD, assists teachers with giving high quality instruction, in charge of FBAs and BIPs.
Best, Gail	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade teacher, instructing students
McKenzie, Renea	Instructional Coach	Leads the MTSS process, in charge of FBAs and BIPs, helps teachers give high quality instruction, in charge of professional development
Young, Judy	Teacher, K-12	4th grade teacher, instructing students
Ledet, Karen	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher, instructing students
Nichols, Annette	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade teacher, instructing students
Coatney, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten teacher, instructing students
Wilson, Paula	Teacher, K-12	1st grade teacher, instructs students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Steve Griffin

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.*
4

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.*
4

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)	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)	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* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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	89	97	88	91	78	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	12	26	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	13	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	112	95	89	85	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	580
Attendance below 90 percent	52	26	13	11	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	6	2	0	0	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	16	14	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	112	95	89	85	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	580
Attendance below 90 percent	52	26	13	11	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	6	2	0	0	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	16	14	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	54%	59%	57%	55%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	49%	53%	49%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	64%	63%	68%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	63%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	51%	50%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	48%	53%	63%	61%	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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%	
	2018	60%	66%	-6%	57%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	61%	65%	-4%	58%	3%	
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	40%	50%	-10%	56%	-16%	
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	48%	51%	-3%	62%	-14%	
	2018	66%	70%	-4%	62%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-18%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	78%	77%	1%	64%	14%	
	2018	67%	73%	-6%	62%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		12%					
05	2019	45%	60%	-15%	60%	-15%	
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	61%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-22%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	37%	47%	-10%	53%	-16%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
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	25	43	43	38	37	22	19				
BLK	52	59		47	59						
MUL	50			55							
WHT	56	57	53	59	57	41	41				
FRL	50	57	53	56	58	43	36				
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	24	43	36	41	45	36	33				
BLK	32	45		54	30		46				
MUL	57	75		50	50						
WHT	56	45	31	66	52	41	56				
FRL	51	46	43	61	46	41	54				
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	19	30	33	33	47	36	10				
BLK	31	43		63	65						
MUL	44	38		69	77						
WHT	59	53	48	69	62	42	65				
FRL	51	48	48	67	64	51	57				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53

Multiracial Students	
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	52
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	50
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.

Based on 2019 data, The lowest performing areas were 5th grade science with only 37% showing proficiency
and 5th grade ELA with only 40% showing proficiency. The consultant that had helped us with Science, Dr. Syzprka changed her test. Teachers are not sure if they had an accurate representation of what was needed to be ready for FCAT. A new curriculum was also introduced. Over the past 5 years 5th grade has not performed as well as the other assessed grade levels. The team has changed annually as we focus on the anomaly.

As for 2020, some of the contributing factors to current lower performance is the pandemic that we are currently in with COVID-19. School was dismissed in March 2020. Lessons were sent home and teachers maintained contact, but many students did not receive quality instruction. Many students had limited internet access to participate in or watch zoom lessons in Google Classroom. We began the 2020-2021 school year with over 150 students enrolled in our Innovative Learning Environment Option. However due to lack of Internet access many were unable to access the curriculum online. Some had to complete work in a more traditional way with paper packets until a jet pack was available for them. Data showed that students who tested at the school scored lower than students who tested at home with their parents. There is reason to believe they received assistance on the iReady assessment. Approximately 50 students have returned to campus for face to face instruction.

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

From 2019 data...
Greatest decline was with 18% in 3rd grade Math. Students using the gridded responses for the first time on the test was huge. This team planned together, had a rigid Math MTSS time, taught the core bell to bell. We are stumped as to why the scores did not reflect the effort put in. The initial assessments given to these students, at the beginning of this school year, even shows that they knew the content and their scores should have been higher. There was a hurricane that closed school for around 2 weeks and caused an influx of students to move in to the school that did not stay long. Plans had to be revamped as well in terms of the orders of instruction and curriculum maps.

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.

From 2019 data...
5th grade ELA and 5th grade Science were both 16 points below the state average. 5th grade teachers changed and historically the grade level has not done well. Teachers were new to the grade level, school, and district. There was a hurricane which affected the length of the school year, curriculum maps and orders of instruction. The school also saw an influx of students who came but then left as soon as homes and schools were made
available in their area again.

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

Per 2019 data...
The most improvement shown was in 4th grade English Language Arts. New actions included: dedicated 30 minute MTSS/FLEX time, having only 2 classes of ELA versus 3, Using the core Wonders Program and the Ready book consistently coupled with student conferencing and feedback with writing, small group instruction and co-teaching, following the scope and sequence of the Wonders program, diligence with iReady computer time, weekly team meetings reassessing goals and sharing strategies and ideas, dedication of the team to teach with fidelity and work well together.

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

Per 2019 data...
Level 1 on state assessment in 4th grade and attendance below 90% in 4th grade. Some teachers have started attendance incentives for the classroom this year. Fifth grade state scores are still of concern so we will continue working on them. We are incorporating AVID strategies throughout 5th grade to help with organization. AVID helps to close the opportunity gap preparing all students for college, careers, and life. It aligns with goals to accelerate and enhance the work that is already happening.

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

Continuation from 2019...
1. 5th grade ELA
2. 5th grade MA
3. 5th grade Science
4. Inclusion
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In grades 3-5 students with disabilities that are on a standard diploma are in general education inclusion classrooms. In grades 3-5 a certified ESE teacher travels between 2 classrooms and assists in Mathematics and English/Language Arts classes. The data shows SWD have scored lower on state assessments. Ideally with support and exposure they will experience greater success on assessments. The students are also grouped according to needs for our FLEX differentiation time with general education MTSS students as needed.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD will score equal to or above the state average on the FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Bush (debbie.bush@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion model classroom with 30 minute pull out instruction based on individual student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district has moved towards this model. Due to COVID last year, the data was not made available. We are using the same strategies and hope to see the scores soar. The resources include the ESE teacher, Read Works, Snap and Read, and other programs to address deficiencies.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will take the iReady beginning assessment and work on the IReady program at their instructional level. They will also receive quality classroom instruction coupled with small group instruction at least 3 times a week to help with mastery of standards.

Person Responsible	Debbie Bush (debbie.bush@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Small group instruction at VES occurs during core instruction time, but it also occurs during the Multiple Tier System of Supports block or MTSS. MTSS is scheduled for each grade level in 30 minute increments. Paraprofessionals that are trained in multiple programs including Connect to Comprehension, Tyner, Great Leaps, and iReady also work with teachers to help students. Small group instruction keeps groups small giving extra support in various areas. Teachers and paraprofessionals collaborate and the groups remain very fluid and flexible. Documentation of what occurs daily in the groups is maintained on a student calendar. Student iReady scores and class assessments are used to determine the best instructional approach to help students with their deficiencies.
Measurable Outcome:	Progress monitoring, such as iReady, STAR, FLKRS, and UPAR, teacher observation, and classroom assessments will be used to measure the outcome. Students in grades 3-5 scored lower than the district and state average in both areas of Math and English. With only 54% of students in grades 3-5 scoring achievement in ELA and only 58% scoring achievement level in Math. The district average was 59% achievement in ELA and 64% achievement in Math. The state average was 57% achievement in ELA and 63% achievement in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Bush (debbie.bush@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction will incorporate deliberate instruction using research and standards based curriculum and resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The state mandates MTSS for certain students but after looking at previous years' data we need to address strengths too. Due to COVID last year, the data was not made available. We are using the same strategies and hope to see the scores soar. The resources include the discussions amongst teachers and paraprofessionals as they use: Connect to Comprehension, Read Works, Snap and Read, and other programs to address deficiencies.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and the academic analysts will look at classroom assessments, goals per IEPs and progress monitoring data to group students to target their needs. Once this data has been collected and analyzed, the team will split students into groups and develop systematic strategies and plans to address student needs.

Person Responsible	Debbie Bush (debbie.bush@wcsdschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will address the attendance of students by keeping in contact with parents, reminding parents that attendance helps with success, and conducting Child Study Team meetings and developing plans for students are not attending school regularly. In the midst of the pandemic, COVID-19 we are also using grace and compassion as we realize that students who do not feel well do not need to be at school infecting others. There will be a nice balance. The Leadership Team will also embrace AVID and the strategies used for the 5th grade students.

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.

We work very hard to have a positive school culture. We encourage our teachers to build relationships with our students to provide a positive role model. Our guidance counselor reads positive statements and challenges to our students on the announcements each week. We have a small number of businesses in our local community that we are able to reach out to. We have several churches that partner with us. We value the relationships with our businesses and church community members. They are invited to our monthly PTO meetings as well as our SAC meetings. We seek their input as to how we can do things better at VES.

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