Vernon High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Vernon High School

3232 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

http://vhs.wcsdschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Ellen Grainger   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	98%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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 High School

3232 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

http://vhs.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)
High School 9-12	Yes	81%

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	B	B	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.

The mission of Vernon High School is to INSPIRE all students to value learning, ENCOURAGE all students to develop ethical decision-making skills, EMPOWER all students to live productive and satisfying lives, and EDUCATE all students to the fullest level of their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vernon High School will become a school of excellence.

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
Riviere, Brian	Principal	The head of the administrative team within a school and is responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the institution. They coordinate staff schedules, oversee the development of curriculum and enforce school policies relating to themes like discipline or safety.
Peterson, Charles	Assistant Principal	The job duties and responsibilities for the Assistant Principal are: Enforcing attendance rules, meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems, responding to disciplinary issues, maintaining school safety procedures, completing walk through and observations, assisting with hiring staff, maintaining systems for attendance and truancy reports, supervising grounds and facilities maintenance, walking the hallways and checking in on teachers and classrooms, and responding to emails from teachers, parents and community members.
Seley, Niki	Instructional Coach	
Harcus, Melba	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Ellen Grainger

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	98%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	106	101	82	382
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	27	19	10	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	25	22	16	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	9	26	13	72

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	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	22	11	70

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	5	0	2	1	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	10	2	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/27/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	103	95	80	396
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4	6	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	12	7	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	36	30	23	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	8	6	36

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	4	1	6	3	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	103	95	80	396
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4	6	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	12	7	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	36	30	23	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	8	6	36

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	4	1	6	3	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4

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	46%	48%	56%	43%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	46%	51%	48%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	32%	42%	35%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	36%	41%	51%	53%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	45%	48%	50%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	38%	45%	59%	50%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	70%	68%	60%	58%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	67%	73%	72%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	45%	47%	-2%	55%	-10%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	47%	2%	53%	-4%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2019	73%	67%	6%	67%	6%	
2018	53%	60%	-7%	65%	-12%	
Compare		20%				

CIVICS EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2019						
2018						

			HISTORY EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	75%	65%	10%	70%	5%	
2018	58%	58%	0%	68%	-10%	
Compare		17%				

			ALGEBRA EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	24%	49%	-25%	61%	-37%	
2018	30%	56%	-26%	62%	-32%	
Compare		-6%				

			GEOMETRY EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	46%	49%	-3%	57%	-11%	
2018	34%	41%	-7%	56%	-22%	
Compare		12%				

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	14	18	12	11	45	53		21		73	
BLK	32	29	7	13	30	25	70	52		94	73
WHT	49	48	33	41	51	62	72	79		89	67
FRL	49	46	27	36	48	55	75	77		83	69

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	5	11	14	5	6	10				74	36
BLK	17	35	44	11	25	29	20	16		95	53
MUL	67	58									
WHT	51	49	28	38	35	29	65	68		86	57
FRL	49	54	44	31	32	29	48	54		82	59

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	11	38		6	33					77	10
BLK	17	42	44	22	41	53	17	57		89	24
MUL	60			50	18						
WHT	46	50	26	59	56	63	64	74		91	61
FRL	37	46	38	48	48	57	58	70		88	49

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	55
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	
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	43
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	
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	59
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	57
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.

Due to COVID 19 pandemic of the 2019/2020 school year, data will be used from the 2018/2019 school year. ELA overall proficiency did not decrease. However, ELA Learning Gains in the lower 25% decreased by 11%. This decline continued a trending decrease of 7% from 2018. There were only two sections of Intensive Reading classes available to struggling reading students. This limited space contributed to the decline in ELA.

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

Due to COVID 19 pandemic of the 2019/2020 school year, data will be used from the 2018/2019 school year.
ELA overall proficiency did not decrease. However, ELA Learning Gains in the lower 25% decreased by 11%. This decline continued a trending decrease of 7% from 2018. There were only two sections of Intensive Reading classes available to struggling reading students. This limited space contributed to the decline in ELA.

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.

Due to COVID 19 pandemic of the 2019/2020 school year, data will be used from the 2018/2019 school year.
Math overall proficiency shows a 15% gap as compared to the state average. Even though this is an improvement form 2018 the growth was not enough to close the achievement gap as compared to the state average. Even with intensive supports and interventions in place during 2018, we realize that more resources and interventions are needed for continued improvement.

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

Due to COVID 19 pandemic of the 2019/2020 school year, data will be used from the 2018/2019 school year.
Biology proficiency increased by 22% and is 15% above the state average. This increase can be directly attributed to small group intervention focussing on standards-based instruction.

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

Due to COVID 19 pandemic of the 2019/2020 school year, data will be used from the 2018/2019 school year.
According to the EWS data, two areas of concern are attendance below 90% and the number of Level 1 students of state assessments.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains
2. Overall ELA / Math Proficiency
3. ELA /Math Learning Gains
4. Maintaining Science and Social Studies Proficiency
5. Subgroup missing the target of 41% (SWD - 31%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified due to a continuing decline in proficiency and learning gains in the lowest 25% of ELA students. Students in this group decreased from 37% making learning gains to 26%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019/20 the ELA lower 25% learning gains will increase at least 10 percentage points to further close the achievement gap between school proficiency in learning gains and the state average in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2019/20 the ELA lower 25% learning gains will increase at least 10 percentage points to further close the achievement gap between school proficiency in learning gains and the state average in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	VHS is required to provide interventions, outside of the ELA classroom, through our MTSS process. MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading are evidenced by identifying struggling reading students and providing specific interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hiring highly qualified, reading endorsed teachers for ELA and intensive reading courses
2. Identifying students for these classes and interventions
3. Review progress monitoring (FAIR) and classroom assessments to monitor student growth
4. Ensure differentiated instruction through classroom observations
5. Provide instructions resources and supports when needed

Person Responsible	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified due to a continuing decline in overall ELA learning gains and no increase in overall proficiency. Students achievement had no increase in proficiency from 2018 and a 2 percentage point decrease in ELA learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019/20 the ELA overall proficiency and learning gains will increase at least 5 percentage points to further close the achievement gap between ELA proficiency and the state average in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2019/20 the ELA overall proficiency and learning gains will increase at least 5 percentage points to further close the achievement gap between ELA proficiency and the state average in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	VHS is required to provide interventions, outside of the ELA classroom, through our MTSS process. MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading are evidenced by identifying struggling reading students and providing specific interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hiring highly qualified, reading endorsed teachers for ELA and intensive reading courses
2. Identifying students for these classes and interventions
3. Review progress monitoring (FAIR) and classroom assessments to monitor student growth
4. Ensure differentiated instruction through classroom observations
5. Provide instructions resources and supports when needed

Person Responsible	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is a critical need as identified in the state assessment data because it is the lowest scoring subgroup that missed the Target Federal Index of 41%. SWD subgroup data shows that only 31% are meeting expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019-202, the SWD subgroup data, as seen in the Target Federal Index of state assessment data for VHS, will increase, at least, 10 percentage points to meet the expectations outlined in the ESSA data collection.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	VHS has 100% of enrolled students attending daily general education classes. This inclusion model ensures that all ESE students are gaining not only exposure to the general education classroom and standards but an opportunity for mastery. ESE support teachers are available for every ELA and math class to provide needed support to students and teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that the benefits of inclusion across the grade levels far outweighs the difficulties it presents. For students with disabilities, inclusion facilitates appropriate social behavior, promotes higher levels of achievement, offers a wide circle of support, and improves the ability of students and teachers to adapt to different teacher and learning styles.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure that every ESE student is enrolled in general education core and elective classes
2. Schedule support teachers so students have access to them during each core class
3. Review student progress at parent/teacher conferences, IEP meetings, etc.

Person Responsible	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Following the Action Steps in 2 E, the school leadership team will provide support and resources needed to ensure all students are given instructional opportunities for making necessary gains.

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.

Research shows that students receive the following benefits from a collaborative partnership with the school, the family and the community: higher grades and test scores, better attendance and homework completion, fewer placements in special education, more positive attitudes and behavior, higher graduation rates and greater enrollment in post secondary education. The gain for families includes: improved understanding of their child's development, improved ability to parent, improved ability to assist their children with school and learning, and improved relationships among all stakeholders.

Parents/families, school faculty representatives, and community members were involved in the development of a written Parent/Family Engagement Plan that has been adopted by the Washington County School District.

One or more parents/families and teachers/staff from each representative school center (VMS and VHS) as well as the business community in the district have been involved in the planning and development of the Parent/Family Engagement Plan. Our School Advisory Council meetings will be held quarterly for the purpose of planning, implementing, and evaluating our plans and expected growth.

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