

Washington County School District

Vernon Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vernon Middle School

3190 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://vms.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Niki Seley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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 (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vernon Middle School

3190 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://vms.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)
Middle School 6-8	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	B	C

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 Middle School I 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 Middle 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	
Short, Sarah	School Counselor	
Brown, Kimberley	Instructional Coach	
Dickson, Becky	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/27/2019, Niki Seley

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

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 (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

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	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	13	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	30	0	0	0	0	103	

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	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	30	0	0	0	0	103

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	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	48%	52%	54%	35%	42%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	54%	36%	43%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	44%	47%	26%	30%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	57%	58%	46%	50%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	59%	57%	44%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	51%	51%	21%	38%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	49%	51%	41%	42%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	75%	72%	56%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	47%	-1%	52%	-6%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	57%	-9%	54%	-6%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	60%	39%	21%	46%	14%
	2018	31%	39%	-8%	45%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	48%	46%	2%	48%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	45%	-10%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	72%	72%	0%	71%	1%
2018	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	49%	46%	61%	34%
2018	88%	56%	32%	62%	26%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%

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	18	24	23	23	44	44	26	50			
BLK	35	44	30	32	44	60	27				
MUL	38	31		50	25						

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
WHT	52	56	49	56	56	45	51	70	55		
FRL	45	50	42	50	50	41	49	68	67		
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	16	46	48	17	46	44	16	44			
BLK	29	48	58	31	52	42	21	55			
HSP	27	45		45	55						
MUL	50	50		70	50						
WHT	46	53	52	55	56	59	35	69	73		
FRL	43	54	59	51	50	48	38	62	63		
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	4	30	33	6	19	21		23			
BLK	29	33	26	29	25	9	24	44			
MUL	45	45		45	55						
WHT	35	36	28	50	48	26	45	60	63		
FRL	35	38	24	44	43	22	42	56	64		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	54
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	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.

Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. State assessment data for 2019 shows that the area of lowest performance is ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains. A contributing factor was the lack of an intensive reading teacher or sections offered for struggling readers. Overall ELA achievement improved from 44% to 48% and ELA Learning Gains only declined by 2 percentage points (53% to 51%). Data suggests that the investment must be made in our struggling readers. In 2019-2020, a Reading Endorsed teacher was hired to provide reading interventions to Tier 2 and 3 students in reading.

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 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. State assessment data shows that the area of greatest decline from the prior year is ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains (from 54% to 41%). A contributing factor is the lack of an intensive reading teacher or sections offered for struggling readers. Overall ELA achievement improved from 44% to 48% and ELA Learning Gains only declined by 2 percentage points (53% to 51%). Data suggests that the investment must be made in our struggling readers. In 2019-2020, a Reading Endorsed teacher was hired to provide reading interventions to Tier 2 and 3 students in reading.

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 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. State assessment data shows the greatest gaps when compared to the state average are in ELA Achievement and ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains. Each component is 6 percentage points below state average. Although our ELA Achievement performance increased from the prior year, the growth was not enough to close the gap of ELA Achievement performance compared to the state. A four year trend to note is that ELA Achievement at VMS since 2016 has been an overall increase (45%, 35%, 44%, 48%) despite the 2017 significance in performance.

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

Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. State assessment data shows the component with the most improvement is Science Achievement (from 35% to 48%). An action that VMS knew was necessary to achieve growth in science was the recruitment and retention of quality science teachers. Students prior to the 2018-2019 school year had numerous

teachers, many of whom were not certified in science. Between each new teacher assignment, substitute teachers were assigned to the 8th grade classroom.

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

From the EWS data, the two potential areas of concern include attendance below 90% and Level 1s on state assessments.

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

Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year.

1. ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains
2. Math Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains / Math Learning Gains
4. Subgroups missing the target of 41% (SWD-32%, African American Students-39%, Multiracial Students-36%)
5. Maintaining growth for ELA, Science, and Social Studies Achievement¹.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. This area of focus is a critical need as identified in the state assessment data because from 2018 to 2019, students in the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile making Learning Gains decreased from 54% to 41%. This area of focus impacts student learning and success by showing that students who are struggling the most (Lowest 25 Percentile) are not making adequate gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. In 2019-2020 the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains, as seen in the state assessment data for VMS, will increase at least 6% points to meet the expectations compared to the state. (from 41% to 47%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	VMS has invested an instructional unit of Intensive Reading. All Level 1 ELA and most Level 2 ELA students are enrolled in this course ensuring they receive differentiated reading interventions daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	VMS is required to provide reading interventions to students through our MTSS process. MTSS research shows that by identifying struggling readers and providing differentiated interventions, students will improve in their ELA performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identifying students for the Intensive Reading course
2. Review progress monitoring (state progress monitoring) and classroom assessment to monitor student growth
3. Ensure differentiated reading instruction through classroom observations and MTSS data
4. Provide instructional resources and support as needed

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. Math Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains. This area of focus is a critical need as identified in the state assessment data because from 2018 to 2019, students in the Math Lowest 25 Percentile making Learning Gains decreased from 54% to 47%. This area of focus impacts student learning and success by showing that students who are struggling the most (Lowest 25 Percentile) are not making adequate gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. In 2019-2020 the Math Lowest 25 Percentile Learning Gains, as seen in the state assessment data for VMS, will increase at least 4% points to meet the expectations compared to the state. (from 47% to 51%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Riviere (brian.riviere@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the math interventionist resigning from the Intensive Math position, VMS will explore options to provide math interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	VMS is required to provide math interventions to students through our MTSS process. MTSS research shows that by identifying students struggling with math and providing differentiated interventions, students will improve in their Math performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identifying students for the Intensive Math course
2. Review progress monitoring (Moby Max) and classroom assessment to monitor student growth
3. Ensure differentiated math instruction through classroom observations and MTSS data
4. Provide instructional resources and support as needed

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. 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 32% are meeting expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	Due to Covid-19 pandemic of 2020, data will be taken from 2018-2019 school year. In 2019-2020, the Students with Disabilities subgroup data, as seen in the Target Federal Index of state assessment data for VMS, will increase at least 9% 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:	VMS 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 or the ELA or math teacher is dually certified in ESE.
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 ELA and math classes
3. Review student progress at parent/teacher conferences, IEP review meetings, etc.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 and approved by the local school advisory council.

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.

VMS builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by advertising and holding a beginning of the school year orientation / open house and parent nights throughout the school year to inform and update families. In addition, community pep rallies during VMS athletic events, community book fair held during Literacy Week, and continual use of social media will be used to inform and encourage all parties to be involved and supportive of our students. Phone links go out regularly to reach an even wider audience, since many of our families do not have internet access in the home.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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