Viera Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Viera Charter School

6206 BRESLAY DR, Viera, FL 32940

www.vieracharterschool.com

Demographics

Principal: Julie Cady

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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)	25%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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

Viera Charter School

6206 BRESLAY DR, Viera, FL 32940

www.vieracharterschool.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)
Combination School KG-8	No	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	31%

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 mission of Viera Charter School is to provide students with a challenging program which emphasizes scientific inquiry, critical thinking, understanding of mathematical concepts and effective communication using innovative reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Viera Charter School recognizes that all children are unique; that each learns in a different style and at a different pace. We strive to meet the individual needs of every student through a variety of programs and differentiated instructional techniques designed to prepare the child for success.

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
Cady, Julie	Principal	The principal is responsible for continuous improvement, efficacy of instruction, monitoring and/or evaluation of personnel, providing feedback to all personnel, budgeting, monitoring and supervision of instructional program. She collaborates with the governing board, community stakeholders and the school leadership team to provide a vision for school success. She also provides guidance and direction to identify goals and responsibilies relative to the school improvement plan. The principal oversees the operation of the entire school.
Spadaccini, Lynn	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal attends all SAC and PTSO meetings in order to collaborate with stakeholders outside of the school. She is resonsible for communiation to the leadership team and among team leaders and individual teachers. She evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices. She additionally is responsible for compliance with Student Progression policies, purchase/inventory/distribution of instructional materials, Parent Academies, scheduling, and monitoring student academic progress. The assistant principal serves as the District Coordinator for the school's AVID program. All of these responsibilities contribute to the success of our student achievement goals.
Goizueta, Chenistique	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach is an integral part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists them in the area of reading and language arts: helps teachers analyze data, facilitates data chats, models instructional practices to improve instruction and classroom management, she completes walkthroughs and gives formative feedback to teachers. The literacy coach will take on the school-level training to earn the Reading Endorsement. She also helps coordinate the Cambridge Program.
Mills, Julie	Dean	The dean is an integral part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists them in the area of mathematics: helps teachers analyze data, facilitates data chats, models instructional practices to improve instruction and classroom management, she completes walkthroughs and gives formative feedback to teachers. She is the iReady Coordinator at our school and ensures teachers and students have access to the program, understand how to use the program and how to use data from the program reports. The dean oversees state testing for our school and facilitates our beginning teacher program.
Rooney, Timothy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal attends all SAC and PTSO meetings in order to collaborate with stakeholders outside of the school. He is resonsible for communiation to the leadership team and among team leaders and individual teachers. He evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices. He additionally is responsible for compliance with school discipline policies, oversees the school's comprehensive sports program, and monitors staff responsible for providing

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		a clean and safe facility. All of these responsibilities contribute to the success of our student achievement goals.
Litchfield, Theresa	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Litchfield is responsible for scheduling and overseeing student services, to include creating plans, holding IPST meetings, conferencing with parents, scheduling services, etc. for students with disabilities, gifted and 504s. She is also responsible for frequent progress monitoring of our SWD.
Norcross, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Norcross is part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists them in the general subject areas: helps teachers analyze data, facilitates data chats, models instructional practices to improve instruction and classroom management. She attends SAC and PTSO meetings to help facilitate the day to day activities of school. She provides professional development training when needed as well as attending leadership meetings and facilitates information to the grade level. She is a grade level lead for our First grade team.
Finnell, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Finnell is part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists them in the general subject areas: helps teachers analyze data, facilitates data chats, models instructional practices to improve instruction and classroom management. She attends SAC and PTSO meetings to help facilitate the day to day activities of school. She provides professional development training when needed as well as attending leadership meetings and facilitates information to the grade levels. She is a vertical team leader for our intermediate elementary grades.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Julie Cady

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.*
3

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
82

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)	25%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	142	129	120	130	126	139	148	200	135	0	0	0	0	1269
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	4	6	2	1	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	1	2	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	14	6	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	9	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	105	107	115	96	106	113	132	137	123	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	7	7	0	6	6	11	10	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	2	5	1	5	5	13	0	0	0	0	37
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	1	7	8	13	13	10	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	2	2	3	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	105	107	115	96	106	113	132	137	123	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	7	7	0	6	6	11	10	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	2	5	1	5	5	13	0	0	0	0	37
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	1	7	8	13	13	10	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	2	2	3	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	65%	61%	80%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	59%	69%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	54%	63%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	82%	67%	62%	81%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	75%	62%	59%	68%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	59%	52%	69%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	78%	62%	56%	71%	62%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	92%	80%	78%	94%	82%	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	73%	64%	9%	58%	15%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					
06	2019	78%	60%	18%	54%	24%
	2018	86%	63%	23%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
07	2019	80%	58%	22%	52%	28%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	51%	31%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					
08	2019	80%	63%	17%	56%	24%
	2018	91%	65%	26%	58%	33%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	60%	18%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%
	2018	81%	68%	13%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
	2018	80%	62%	18%	54%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	83%	43%	40%	46%	37%
	2018	74%	41%	33%	45%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	53%	21%	48%	26%
	2018	78%	55%	23%	50%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	97%	66%	31%	67%	30%
2018	100%	67%	33%	65%	35%
Compare		-3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	74%	19%	71%	22%
2018	90%	73%	17%	71%	19%
Compare		3%			

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	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	60%	36%	57%	39%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-4%			

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	41	44	48	39	51	48	27				
ELL	67	69	64	67	76	62	40				
ASN	79	76		95	94						
BLK	54	55	53	59	65	61	54				
HSP	80	61	65	71	65	54	74		75		
MUL	79	67	50	79	74		100				
WHT	81	64	54	85	77	62	79	92	67		
FRL	65	56	46	67	71	58	64	81	50		

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	36	50	48	43	31	21	18				
ELL	65	62		65	57						
ASN	82	65		91	80						
BLK	68	58	62	39	36	46	64				
HSP	72	60	44	72	56	56	75	93	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
MUL	88	90		79	65		93		36		
WHT	85	69	56	82	59	57	84	89	66		
FRL	70	66	53	63	53	54	74	77	39		

| 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	46	48	48	50	61	44	33				
ELL	42			42	64						
ASN	86	69		90	81						
BLK	72	55		50	71						
HSP	70	67	81	76	69	53	40	91	31		
MUL	77	72	82	85	69		87	90			
WHT	82	70	59	83	66	69	73	96	64		
FRL	77	69	63	73	64	74	64	91	40		

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	73
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	654
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	64
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	68
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	75
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	73
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The areas showing the lowest performance are 3rd grade ELA and 5th grade Science. Contributing factors may be a shift in the population attending VCS. Trend data on 5th grade Science indicates this area has been consistently been a low performance area for VCS as well as the entire Brevard district.

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

The greatest decline occurred in 8th grade ELA, with -11% on the same grade comparison. However, the cohort comparison shows a decline of only 2%. Yet, the school continues to have outstanding performance with 80% of the population showing proficiency.

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 greatest gap is between the school and state proficiency on Algebra I. Across the state only 61% of the students were proficient, where 100% of VCS were proficient. VCS carefully selects students for Algebra I using a rubric including the Orleans-Hanna, FSA scores and report card grades. We believe we are selecting appropriate students who are ready for the rigors of this High School course.

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

Fifth grade mathematics showed the greatest improvement with an increase of 8% in the same-grade comparison and a 1% increase in the cohort comparison. This increase is the result of implementing a new mathematics program as well as making staffing changes.

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

Two potential areas of concern are "attendance below 90%" and "level one on state wide assessments". VCS will address both areas by increasing rigor and engagement in the classroom.

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

1. Increase rigor across the curriculum to ensure all students are challenged.
2. Increase engagement by incorporating the innovative instructional methods of Problem Based Learning, Cambridge and AVID.
3.

4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research indicates a strong correlation between student engagement, academic rigor, and student learning/student achievement. VCS has exceptionally strong teachers, however walk-through data reveal that some classrooms are not offering engaging, rigorous instruction for all students. In order for all students to succeed, VCS will increase engagement, defined as active student participation and time on task, by incorporating Cambridge and AVID strategies across all grade levels and Fundations, a highly engaging, research-based phonics program in grades K-3.
Measurable Outcome:	Viera Charter School will improve ELA performance from 79% proficiency to 81% proficiency; mathematics will improve from 82% to 84%; Science from 78% to 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement AVID - WICOR across all content areas in grades K-8 so that writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization and reading becomes part of every course; Implement AVID Collaborative Study Groups in grades 6-8; Incorporate Cambridge Global Perspectives challenges into social studies classrooms schoolwide; and provide direct, hands-on phonics instruction to students in grades K-3.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that these strategies are high impact with student learning and implemented with fidelity will increase overall student performance. Our teachers provide the resources through their extensive training on the various strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Share school-wide data with all stakeholders; analyze subgroup/ESSA data.

Person Responsible	Julie Cady (jcady@vieracharterschool.com)

Identify areas of concern at each grade level.

Person Responsible	Julie Mills (jmills@vieracharterschool.com)

Provide professional development for WICOR, Collaborative Study Groups, Cambridge Challenges, and Fundations Phonics Program. Discuss expectations for their use in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)

Instructional Coach and AVID Coordinator will support teachers' consistent use of AVID, Cambridge and Fundations.

Person Responsible	Chenistique Goizueta (cgoizueta@charter12.com)

Administrators, coach and AVID Coordinator will conduct walk-throughs throughout the week and give trend and specific feedback to teachers relative to implementation and use of WICOR, Collaborative Study Groups, Cambridge Challenges and Fundations.

Person Responsible	Theresa Litchfield (tlitchfield@vieracharterschool.com)

Monitor student performance by tracking iReady data and student grades.

Person Responsible	Julie Mills (jmills@vieracharterschool.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Currently, only 41% of our students with disabilities were proficient on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment. Since 59% of this population is not proficient, improving their performance is a critical need.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 50% of our students with disabilities will be proficient in the area of reading on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Theresa Litchfield (tlitchfield@vieracharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase progress monitoring for the students with disabilities, so that we are assessing them monthly. Once data are available, the ESE team and Literacy Coach will analyze data and plan instruction to address weak areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have selected this strategy because we progress monitor all students quarterly. This subpopulation need more frequent monitoring so we can adjust instruction in response. Doing so will allow us to intervene and get the student back on track without having to wait several weeks.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify a diagnostic tool to assess all SWD.
Assess SWD using DRA3
Analyze DRA3 results to determine academic areas of instruction on which to focus
Plan and deliver small group instruction to address academic focus areas
Identify a Progress Monitoring Tool to monitor their response to instruction
Offer remediation/tutoring for students who need additional support based on progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Theresa Litchfield (tlitchfield@vieracharterschool.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School-wide improvement priorities were not identified for Viera Charter School (VCS) since all subgroups performed well above the 41% proficiency level. Therefore, VCS has identified only one school-wide Area of Focus.

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.

Viera Charter School is passionate about doing whatever it takes to provide the best education for our students. We are positive influencers for each other and do our jobs by utilizing, sharing and maximizing our knowledge, skills and ability. We know and follow the standards, policies and procedures and go well beyond our usual professional expectations. We are committed to the power of honest, intentional communication. We work together within a team environment of mutual respect, honesty and integrity. We are intentional about protecting our relationships with one another including parents, students, teachers, administrators and our governing board. This year has been like no other with preparing to open a new building and venturing into eLearning. We have made a concerted effort to provide the same activities and communication and activities as we have provided in the past. However, to keep our students and staff safe, we have moved to a virtual platform for Meet the Teacher, Open House, Parent Academies and Awards Ceremonies. We are even going to hold our annual Career Day, but will ask parents and community members to submit 8-12 minute videos highlighting their careers. This allows us to reach beyond the family members who live in Brevard, we have an opportunity to gather a video library that includes careers of relatives that live outside the state or country. We hope to build a large inventory of career videos for teachers to access in addition to other Career Day activities they may do in their classrooms. The administrative team will review videos prior to posting them to determine the appropriate library (K-2, 3-5, or 6-8).

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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